TRANSFORMATION THEORY AND CHRISTOFFEL FORMULAS FOR MATRIX BIORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS ON THE REAL LINE (with applications to the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice and noncommutative KP hierarchies)

CARLOS ÁLVAREZ-FERNÁNDEZ[1,✠], GERARDO ARIZNABARRETA[2,✠,†], JUAN C. GARCÍA-ARDILA[3,‡], MANUEL MAÑAS[2,✠], AND FRANCISCO MARCELLÁN[3,4,‡]

arXiv:1605.04617v7 [math.CA] 25 Aug 2016

ABSTRACT. In this paper transformations for matrix orthogonal polynomials in the real line are studied. The orthogonality is understood in a broad sense, and is given in terms of a nondegenerate continuous sesquilinear form, which in turn is determined by a quasidefinite matrix of bivariate generalized functions with a well defined support. The discussion of the orthogonality for such a sesquilinear form includes, among others, matrix Hankel cases with linear functionals, general matrix Sobolev orthogonality and discrete orthogonal polynomials with an infinite support. The results are mainly concerned with the derivation of Christoffel type formulas, which allow to express the perturbed matrix biorthogonal polynomials and its norms in terms of the original ones. The basic tool is the Gauss–Borel factorization of the Gram matrix, and particular attention is paid to the non-associative character, in general, of the product of semi-infinite matrices.

The first transformation considered is that of Geronimus type, in where a right multiplication by the inverse of a matrix polynomial and an addition of adequate masses is performed. The resolvent matrix and connection formulas are given. Two different methods are developed. A spectral one, based on the spectral properties of the perturbing polynomial, and constructed in terms of the second kind functions. This approach requires the perturbing matrix polynomial to have a nonsingular leading term. Then, using spectral techniques and spectral jets, Christoffel-Geronimus formulas for the transformed polynomials and norms are presented. For this type of transformations, the paper also proposes an alternative method, which does not require of spectral techniques, that is valid also for singular leading coefficients. When the leading term is nonsingular a comparative of both methods is presented. The nonspectral method is applied to unimodular Christoffel perturbations, and a simple example for a degree one massless Geronimus perturbation is given. A discussion on Geronimus–Uvarov transformations is presented. These transformations are rational perturbations of the matrix of bivariate generalized functions together with an addition of appropriate masses, determined these last ones by the spectral properties of the polynomial denominator. As for the Geronimus case, two techniques are applied, spectral and mixed spectral/nonspectral. Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas are found with both approaches and some applications are given. For example, to transformations preserving the symmetric character of the sesquilinear form, where the adjugate of the perturbing matrix polynomial is instrumental, and also to matrix hodographic perturbations, with both polynomials of degree one. To complete the list of transformations, additive perturbations and in particular matrix Uvarov transformations are considered. Christoffel–Uvarov formulas are given for the perturbed biorthogonal families and its matrix norms, in terms of spectral jets of the Christoffel–Darboux kernels. Applications to discrete Sobolev matrix orthogonal polynomials are provided.

Finally, the transformation theory is discussed in the context of the 2D non-Abelian Toda lattice and noncommutative KP hierarchies, understood as the theory of continuous transformations of quasidefinite sesquilinear forms. The interplay between transformations and integrable flows is discussed. Miwa shifts, τ-ratio matrix functions and Sato formulas are given. Bilinear identities, involving either Geronimus–Uvarov or Uvarov transformations, first for the Baker functions, second then for the biorthogonal polynomials and its second kind functions and finally for the τ-ratio matrix functions are found.

[1]DEPARTAMENTO DE MÉTODOS CUANTITATIVOS, UNIVERSIDAD PONTIFICIA COMILLAS, C/ DE ALBERTO AGUILERA 23, 28015 MADRID, SPAIN

[2]DEPARTAMENTO DE FÍSICA TEÓRICA II (MÉTODOS MATEMÁTICOS DE LA FÍSICA), UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, PLAZA DE CIENCIAS 1, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN

[3]DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD CARLOS III DE MADRID, AVD/ UNIVERSIDAD 30, 28911 LEGANÉS, SPAIN

[4]INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS (ICMAT), C/ NICOLÁS CABRERA 13-15, 28049 CANTO BLANCO, SPAIN

E-mail addresses: calvarez@comillas.edu, gariznab@ucm.es, jugarcia@math.uc3m.es, manuel.manas@ucm.es, pacomarc@ing.uc3m.es.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42C05,15A23.

Key words and phrases. Matrix biorthogonal polynomials, spectral theory of matrix polynomials, quasidefinite matrix of generalized kernels, nondegenerate continuous sesquilinear forms, Gauss–Borel factorization, matrix Geronimus transformations, matrix linear spectral transformations, matrix Uvarov transformations, Christoffel type formulas, quasideterminants, spectral jets, unimodular matrix polynomials, 2D non-Abelian Toda lattice hierarchy, noncommutative KP hierarchy, bilinear identities.

✠Thanks financial support from the Spanish "Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad" research project [MTM2015-65888-C4-3-P], *Ortogonalidad, teoría de la aproximación y aplicaciones en física matemática*.

†Thanks financial support from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid Program "Ayudas para Becas y Contratos Complutenses Predoctorales en España 2011".

‡Thanks financial support from the Spanish "Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad" research project [MTM2015-65888-C4-2-P], *Ortogonalidad, teoría de la aproximación y aplicaciones en física matemática*.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Objectives, methodology and results 4
1.2. Layout of the paper 5
1.3. On spectral theory of matrix polynomials 6
1.4. On orthogonal matrix polynomials 12
2. Matrix Geronimus transformations 25
2.1. The resolvent and connection formulas 26
2.2. Geronimus transformations and Christoffel–Darboux kernels 29
2.3. Spectral jets and relations for the perturbed polynomials and its second kind functions 30
2.4. Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas 36
2.5. Nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas 41
2.6. Spectral versus nonspectral 46
2.7. Applications 47
3. Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformations 54
3.1. The resolvent and connection formulas for the matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation 55
3.2. Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation and Christoffel–Darboux kernels 57
3.3. On the first family of linearly spectral transformed second kind functions 59
3.4. Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas 62
3.5. Mixed spectral/nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas 69
3.6. Applications 74
4. Matrix Uvarov transformations 77
4.1. Additive perturbations 77
4.2. Matrix Christoffel–Uvarov formulas for Uvarov additive perturbations 79
4.3. Applications 82
5. Applications to the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice and noncommutative KP hierarchies 86
5.1. Non Abelian 2D-Toda hierarchy 87
5.2. Baker functions 88
5.3. Noncommutative KP hierarchy 90
5.4. Transformation theory 92
5.5. Christoffel and Geronimus transformations, Miwa shifts, τ-type matrix functions and Sato formulas 93
5.6. Bilinear identity and Geronimus–Uvarov and Uvarov transformations 96
Appendix A. Table with transformations: chart of results 99
References 100

1. INTRODUCTION

Perturbations of a linear functional u in the linear space of polynomials with real coefficients have been extensively studied in the theory of orthogonal polynomials on the real line (scalar OPRL). In particular, when you deal with the positive definite case, i.e. linear functionals associated with probability measures supported in an infinite subset of the real line is considered, such perturbations provide an interesting information in the framework of Gaussian quadrature rules taking into account the perturbation yields new nodes and Christoffel numbers, see [52, 53]. Three perturbations have attracted the interest of the researchers. Christoffel perturbations, that appear when you consider a new functional $\hat{u} = p(x)u$, where $p(x)$ is a polynomial, were studied in 1858 by the German mathematician E. B. Christoffel in [31], in the framework of Gaussian quadrature rules. He found explicit formulas relating the corresponding sequences of orthogonal polynomials with respect to two measures, the Lebesgue measure $d\mu$ supported in the interval $(-1, 1)$ and $d\hat{\mu}(x) = p(x)d\mu(x)$, with $p(x) = (x - q_1)\cdots(x - q_N)$ a signed polynomial in the support of $d\mu$, as well as the distribution of their zeros as nodes in such quadrature rules. Nowadays, these are called Christoffel formulas, and can be considered a classical result in the theory of orthogonal polynomials which can be found in a number of textbooks, see for example [30, 116, 53]. Explicit relations between the corresponding sequences of orthogonal polynomials have been extensively studied, see [52], as well

as the connection between the corresponding monic Jacobi matrices in the framework of the so-called Darboux transformations based on the LU factorization of such matrices [23]. In the theory of orthogonal polynomials, connection formulas between two families of orthogonal polynomials allow to express any polynomial of a given degree n as a linear combination of all polynomials of degree less than or equal to n in the second family. A noteworthy fact regarding the Christoffel finding is that in some cases the number of terms does not grow with the degree n but remarkably, and on the contrary, remain constant, equal to the degree of the perturbing polynomial. See [52, 53] for more on the Christoffel type formulas.

Geronimus transformation appears when you are dealing with perturbed functionals ν defined by $p(x)\nu = u$, where $p(x)$ is a polynomial. Such a kind of transformations were used by the Russian mathematician J. L. Geronimus, see [58], in order to have a nice proof of a result by W. Hahn [71] concerning the characterization of classical orthogonal polynomials (Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel) as those orthogonal polynomials whose first derivatives are also orthogonal polynomials, for an English account of Geronimus' paper [58] see [63]. Again, as happened for the Christoffel transformation, within the Geronimus transformation one can find Christoffel type formulas, now in terms of the second kind functions, relating the corresponding sequences of orthogonal polynomials, see for example the work of P. Maroni [88] for a perturbation of the type $p(x) = x - a$. Despite that in [58] no Christoffel type formula was derived, in the present paper, in order to distinguish these Christoffel type formulas from those for Christoffel transformations, we refer to them as Christoffel–Geronimus formulas. The relation between the monic Jacobi matrices has been studied by using the so-called Darboux transformation with parameter [23]. The more general problem related to linear functionals u and ν satisfying $p(x)u = q(x)\nu$, where $p(x), q(x)$ are polynomials has been analyzed in [126] when u, ν are positive definite measures supported on the real line and in [43] when linear functionals are considered, see also [128]. The Russian mathematician V. B. Uvarov found [126] Christoffel type formulas, that allow for any pair of perturbing polynomials $p(x)$ and $q(x)$, to find the new orthogonal polynomials in terms of determinantal expressions of the original unperturbed second kind functions and orthogonal polynomials. On the other hand, the addition of a finite number of Dirac masses to a linear functional appears in the framework of the spectral analysis of fourth order linear differential operators with polynomial coefficients and with orthogonal polynomials as eigenfunctions. Therein you have the so called Laguerre-type, Legendre-type and Jacobi-type orthogonal polynomials introduced by H. L. Krall, see [76], and later on deeply studied in [75]. A more general analysis from the point of view of the algebraic properties of the sequences of orthogonal polynomials associated to the linear functionals u and $w = u + \sum_{n=0}^{N} M_n \delta(x - a_n)$, the so-called general Uvarov transformation in [128], has been done for the positive definite case in [126], and in more general cases in [83] and [29].

The case of Hermitian linear functionals in the linear space of Laurent polynomials with complex coefficients is intimately related with the theory of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (in short OPUC). Indeed, if u is a positive definite Hermitian linear functional, then there exists a probability measure supported on an infinite subset of the unit circle that provides an integral representation for such a functional (the solution of the trigonometric moment problem). In analogy with the case of OPRL, perturbations of such linear functionals have been analyzed in the literature. For the analogue of the Christoffel transformation, see [60], where extensions of the Christoffel determinantal type formulas were found using the original Szegő polynomials and its Christoffel–Darboux kernels. For the Geronimus transformation see [61] and for the Uvarov transformation, see [25]. Later, in [72], alternative formulas *á la Christoffel* were presented in terms determinantal expressions of the Szegő polynomials and its reverse polynomials, and these results were extended in [105] for biorthogonal polynomials. The connection between the Hessenberg matrices —GGT (Gragg–Geronimus–Tepliaev) matrices according to the terminology in [112]— associated to the multiplication operator has been explored in [28]. For the CMV (Cantero–Moral–Velázquez) matrices, which constitute the representation of the multiplication operator in terms of the basis of orthonormal Laurent polynomials, see [26] where the connection with Darboux transformations and their applications to integrable systems has been analyzed. Regarding the CMV ordering, orthogonal Laurent polynomials and Toda systems, see §4.4 of [8] where discrete Toda flows and its connection with Darboux transformations were discussed. For a matrix version of this discussion see [15].

Was M. G. Krein in [74] the first to discuss matrix orthogonal polynomials, for a review on the subject see [33]. The great activity in this scientific field has produced a vast bibliography, treating among other things subjects like inner products defined on the linear space of polynomials with matrix coefficients or aspects as the existence of the corresponding sequences of matrix orthogonal polynomials in the real line, see [45, 46, 93, 102, 115]) and

their applications in Gaussian quadrature for matrix-valued functions [114], scattering theory [14, 57] and system theory [51]. The seminal paper [47] gave the key for further studies in this subject and, subsequently, some relevant advances has been achieved in the study of families of matrix orthogonal polynomials associated to second order linear differential operators as eigenfunctions and their structural properties [45, 66, 67, 48]. In [27] sequences of orthogonal polynomials satisfying a first order linear matrix differential equation were found, which is a remarkable difference with the scalar scenario, where such a situation does not appear. The spectral problem for second order linear difference operators with polynomial coefficients has been considered in [13]. Therein four families of matrix orthogonal polynomials (as matrix relatives of Charlier, Meixner, Krawtchouk scalar polynomials and another one that seems not have any scalar relative) are obtained as illustrative examples of the method described therein.

The Japanese mathematician M. Sato and the Kyoto school [107, 108, 35, 36, 37] gave a Lie group theoretical setting for integrable hierarchies of nonlinear partial differential/difference equations, and in [97] a mathematical description of factorization problems, dressing procedure, and linear systems can be found. For the 2D lattice Toda lattice hierarchy see [122, 123, 124], and §3 in [124]. Multicomponent versions of the Kadomtsev–Petvhiasvili (KP) hierarchy were analyzed in [107, 21, 22, 42, 79, 80]. Block Hankel/Toeplitz reductions, discrete flows, additional symmetries and dispersionless limits for the multi-component 2D Toda lattice hierarchy were discussed in [81, 82], and the connection with multiple orthogonal polynomials was considered in [7, 10]. The papers [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] showed that the Gauss–Borel factorization problem is a keystone for the connection between integrable system and orthogonal polynomials. These papers clearly established –from a group-theoretical setup– why standard orthogonality of polynomials and integrability of nonlinear equations of Toda type where so close. Non-Abelian versions of Toda equations and its relation with matrix orthogonal polynomials was studied, for example, in [93, 10] (on the real line) and in [94, 17] (on the unit circle).

The transformations studied in this paper are also known in the Theory of Orthogonal Polynomials, as well as in Integrable Systems Theory, as Darboux transformations, denomination that was coined in [89]. The motivation, for that name, was the studies of the French mathematician G. Darboux that, when studying the Sturm–Liouville theory in [34], explicitly found these transformations, which he obtained by a simplification of a geometrical transformation founded previously by the French mathematician T. Moutard [96]. See [118] for a review of these transformations, in the context of orthogonal polynomials, under the light of the factorization of the Jacobi matrices. See also [64, 65] for the study of bispectrality. In the Differential Geometry, see [49], the Christoffel, Geronimus, Uvarov and linear spectral transformations are related to geometrical transformations like the Laplace, Lévy, adjoint Lévy and the fundamental Jonas transformations. See [44] for a discrete version of these geometrical transformations, and its connection with integrable systems. The interested reader may consult the excellent monographs [90] and [103].

The scheme based on the Gauss–Borel factorization problem, used here for transformations for matrix orthogonal polynomials or non-Abelian 2D Toda lattices, has been applied also in the following situations

i) Matrix orthogonal polynomials, its Christoffel transformations and the relation with non-Abelian Toda hierarchies were studied in [12], a paper that can be understood as the seed of the present one.
ii) Multiple orthogonal polynomials and multicomponent Toda [11].
iii) For matrix orthogonal Laurent polynomials on the unit circle, CMV orderings, and non-Abelian lattices on the circle [15].
iv) Multivariate orthogonal polynomials in several real variables and corresponding multispectral integrable Toda hierarchy [16, 17].
v) Finally, multivariate orthogonal polynomials on the multidimensional unit torus, the multivariate extension of the CMV ordering and integrable Toda hierarchies [19].

1.1. **Objectives, methodology and results.** The main objective of this paper is to study the theory of transformations of matrix orthogonal polynomials in the real line and to derive Christoffel type formulas for the perturbed polynomials and norms in terms of the primitive ones. The framework for matrix orthogonality is that of continuous sesquilinear forms in the space of matrix polynomials. We will extend the idea of *noyau-distribution* (that we call generalized kernel) introduced by the French mathematician L. Schwartz in [110] to this matrix context. These general non Hankel scenarios have been discussed in the scalar case in different contexts, for an orthogonal polynomial approach see [24] while from an integrable systems point of view see [1, 2]. We will consider

an arbitrary nondegenerate continuous sesquilinear form given by a matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y}$ with a quasidefinite Gram matrix. This scheme contains the more usual choices of Gram matrices like those of Hankel type, or those leading to matrix discrete orthogonality or matrix Sobolev orthogonality, but not only, as these examples correspond to matrices of generalized kernels supported by the diagonal $u_{x,y} = u_{x,x}$, [69], and our scheme is applicable to the general case, with support off the diagonal. The quasidefinite condition on the Gram matrix ensures for a block Gauss–Borel factorization and, consequently, for the existence of two biorthogonal families of matrix polynomials. The manipulation of semi-infinite matrices must be done with care. In particular, attention must be paid to the fact that, in general, the product of three semi-infinite matrices, A, B and C is not associative and, therefore, it could happen that $(AB)C \neq A(BC)$, see [32]. Basic objects in the theory of matrix orthogonal polynomials on the real line, like second kind functions and mixed Christoffel–Darboux kernels will be instrumental in the finding of Christoffel type formulas.

The perturbations or transformations of our sesquilinear forms are of rational type, with an additive term $v_{x,y}$. For example, for the Geronimus-Uvarov transformation, also known as linear spectral transformation for the scalar standard case [128], we will consider the right multiplication of the matrix of generalized kernels by the inverse of a matrix polynomial and on its left by another matrix polynomial, $u_{x,y} \mapsto W_C(x)u_{x,y}(W_G(y))^{-1}+v_{x,y}$, with a Geronimus reduction when $W_C(x) = I_p$ is the identity matrix. As we deal with the inverse of matrix polynomials we need the spectrum of the denominator not to lay in the support of the generalized kernels, i.e. we will perturb matrices of generalized kernels with well defined support. The final objective is the finding of Christoffel type formulas for matrix versions of the Geronimus, Geronimus–Uvarov and Uvarov transformations. In doing so, we will use for the two first mentioned transformations two different methods, which happen to be equivalent when the leading coefficient of the perturbing polynomial in the denominator is nonsingular. The first one is based on the spectral properties of the perturbing denominator matrix polynomial, and uses the second kind functions, Christoffel–Darboux kernels and its mixed version. For quasideterminantal Christoffel type expressions, see Theorems 2 and 6. The second method, which is based on the orthogonality relations, i.e., the Gauss–Borel factorization, allows to treat the singular leading term as well, and does not require of the second kind functions. The Christoffel type formulas, expressed in terms of quasideterminants, derived within this method are given in Theorems 4 and 8. These Geronimus and Geronimus–Uvarov allow for additive terms, the masses, constructed in the y-variable in terms of the spectral elements, like eigenvalues and root polynomials, of the denominator polynomial, while in the x variable do depend on linearly independent arbitrary vectorial generalized functions. Matrix Uvarov transformations $u_{x,y} \mapsto u_{x,y} + v_{x,y}$ are discussed in full generality by considering the addition of a matrix of generalized kernels $v_{x,y}$ with arbitrary linearly independent matrices of generalized functions in the x variable accomplished with finite support arbitrary order matrices of generalized functions in the y-variable. The corresponding Christoffel type formulas are given in Theorem 10, and some applications to discrete Sobolev matrix orthogonal polynomials are presented.

An important motivation for the research contained in this paper is the strong relation of the Gauss–Borel factorization of general Gram matrices and integrable systems of Toda type, see [1, 2, 9]. In [12] we studied how the matrix Christoffel transformation accomplishes with the continuous Toda flows. Similar argumentation leads, in this paper, to the extension of matrix Geronimus, Geronimus–Uvarov and Uvarov transformations to the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice and noncommutative KP hierarchies. Using first order Christoffel and Geronimus perturbations we construct Miwa shifts and corresponding Sato type formula for the biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its second kind functions, for that aim we introduce two τ-type matrix functions, see Theorem 11. We also discuss, in Theorem 12, three different sets of bilinear identities, the first one involving the Baker functions, the second one giving an identity constructed in terms of the biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its second kind functions, and finally, the third one, involving the mentioned τ-ratio matrices.

1.2. **Layout of the paper.** We continue this introduction with two introductory subsections. One is focused on the spectral theory of matrix polynomials, we follow [62]. The other is a basic background on matrix orthogonal polynomials, see [33]. In the second section we extend the Geronimus transformations to the matrix realm, and find connection formulas for the biorthogonal polynomials and the Christoffel–Darboux kernels. These developments allow for the finding of the Christoffel–Geronimus formula for matrix perturbations of Geronimus type. As we said we present two different schemes. In the first one, which can be applied when the perturbing polynomial has a nonsingular leading coefficient, we express the perturbed objects in terms of spectral jets of

the primitive second kind functions and Christoffel–Darboux kernels. We present a second approach, applicable even when the leading coefficient is singular. For each method we consider two different situations, the less interesting case of biorthogonal polynomials of degree less than the degree of the perturbing polynomial, and the much more interesting situation whence the degrees of the families of biorthogonal polynomials are greater than or equal to the degree of the perturbing polynomial. To end the section, we compare spectral versus nonspectral methods and present a number of applications. In particular, we deal with unimodular polynomial matrix perturbations and degree one matrix Geronimus transformations. Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformations are discussed in §3, where we extend the ideas developed for the Geronimus case in §2. Mixed spectral/nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas are given and some applications to Christoffel transformations with singular leading coefficients and spectral symmetric transformations are discussed. As a last example, we explicitly treat degree one Geronimus–Uvarov transformations. In §4, the matrix extension of Uvarov transformations is given within the framework of additive perturbations of generalized kernels. Matrix Christoffel–Uvarov formulas for finite discrete support additive perturbations are given and reductions to Uvarov perturbations supported by the diagonal $y = x$ are discussed. Finally, in §5 applications to non-Abelian Toda and noncommutative KP hierarchies are considered. In particular, Sato formulas are given and bilinear identities derived. For a table containing all transformations charting the corresponding results see §A.

1.3. **On spectral theory of matrix polynomials.** Here we give some background material regarding the spectral theory of matrix polynomials [62, 85].

Definition 1. *Let $A_0, A_1 \cdots, A_N \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ be square matrices of size $p \times p$ with complex entries. Then*

$$W(x) = A_N x^N + A_{N-1} x^{N-1} + \cdots + A_1 x + A_0 \tag{1}$$

is said to be a matrix polynomial of degree N, $\deg(W(x)) = N$. The matrix polynomial is said to be monic when $A_N = I_p$, where $I_p \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ denotes the identity matrix. The linear space –a bimodule for the ring of matrices $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$– of matrix polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$.

Definition 2 (Eigenvalues)**.** *The spectrum, or the set of eigenvalues, $\sigma(W(x))$ of a matrix polynomial W is the zero set of $\det W(x)$, i.e.*

$$\sigma(W(x)) := \{x \in \mathbb{C} : \det W(x) = 0\}.$$

Proposition 1. *A monic matrix polynomial $W(x)$, $\deg(W(x)) = N$, has Np (counting multiplicities) eigenvalues or zeros, i.e., we can write*

$$\det W(x) = \prod_{a=1}^{q} (x - x_a)^{\alpha_a},$$

with $Np = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_q$.

Remark 1. *Given the spectrum $\sigma(W(x)) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_q\}$, when we need to discuss generic properties associated to an eigenvalue, and there is no need to specify which, for the sake of simplicity will denote such an eigenvalue by x_0. Thus, x_0 could be any of the eigenvalues $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_q$.*

Remark 2. *We use $A^\top$ to denote the transpose of A, which constitutes an antiautomorphism of order two in the ring of complex matrices. From $\det\left(\big(W(x)\big)^\top\right) = \det(W(x))$ it follows that the spectrum, eigenvalues, and multiplicities of $W(x)$ and $\big(W(x)\big)^\top$ coincide. Consequently,*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ker}\left((W(x))^\top\right) = \dim \operatorname{Ker}(W(x)).$$

Remark 3. *We will denote the dual space of $\mathbb{C}^p$, or space of covectors, by $\big(\mathbb{C}^p\big)^*$. Given a linear subspace $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ we define its orthogonal complement as $\mathcal{V}^\perp := \{l \in \big(\mathbb{C}^p\big)^* : l(v) = 0 \text{juad} \forall v \in \mathcal{V}\}$. Given a linear map $A : \mathbb{C}^p \to \mathbb{C}^p$, which we identify to its matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, we have that the left null space $\operatorname{Ker}(A^\top) \cong \big(\operatorname{Im}(A)\big)^\perp$. Indeed, any vector v in the cokernel satisfies $v^\top A = 0$, thus $v^\top \in \big(\operatorname{Im}(A)\big)^\perp$.*

Proposition 2. *Any nonsingular matrix polynomial* $W(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$, $\det W(x) \neq 0$, *can be represented*

$$W(x) = E_{x_0}(x)\,\mathrm{diag}((x-x_0)^{\kappa_1},\dots,(x-x_0)^{\kappa_m})F_{x_0}(x)$$

at $x = x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, *where* $E_{x_0}(x)$ *and* $F_{x_0}(x)$ *are nonsingular matrices and* $\kappa_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \kappa_m$ *are nonnegative integers. Moreover,* $\{\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m\}$ *are uniquely determined by* $W(x)$ *and they are known as partial multiplicities of* $W(x)$ *at* x_0.

Definition 3. *For an eigenvalue* x_0 *of a monic matrix polynomial* $W(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$, *then:*

i) *A non-zero vector* $r_0 \in \mathbb{C}^p$ *is said to be a right eigenvector, with eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$, *whenever* $W(x_0)r_0 = 0$, *i.e.,* $r_0 \in \operatorname{Ker} W(x_0) \neq \{0\}$.

ii) *A non-zero covector* $l_0 \in \left(\mathbb{C}^p\right)^*$ *is said to be an left eigenvector, with eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$, *whenever* $l_0W(x_0) = 0, \left(l_0\right)^\top \in \left(\operatorname{Ker}(W(x_0))\right)^\perp = \operatorname{Ker}\left((W(x_0))^\top\right) \neq \{0\}$.

iii) *A sequence of vectors* $\{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{m-1}\}$ *is said to be a right Jordan chain of length* m *corresponding to the eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$, *if* r_0 *is an right eigenvector of* $W(x_0)$ *and*

$$\sum_{s=0}^{j} \frac{1}{s!}\frac{d^s W}{d\,x^s}\Big|_{x=x_0} r_{j-s} = 0, \qquad\qquad j \in \{0,\dots,m-1\}.$$

iv) *A sequence of covectors* $\{l_0, l_{a,1}\dots, l_{m-1}\}$ *is said to be a left Jordan chain of length* m, *corresponding to* $x_0 \in \sigma(W^\top)$, *if* $\{(l_0)^\top, (l_1)^\top, \dots, (l_{m-1})^\top\}$ *is a right Jordan chain of length* m *for the matrix polynomial* $\left(W(x)\right)^\top$.

v) *A right root polynomial at* x_0 *is a non-zero vector polynomial* $r(x) \in \mathbb{C}^p[x]$ *such that* $W(x)r(x)$ *has a zero of certain order at* $x = x_0$, *the order of this zero is called the order of the root polynomial. Analogously, a left root polynomial is a non-zero covector polynomial* $l(x) \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^*[x]$ *such that* $l(x_0)W(x_0) = 0$.

vi) *The maximal lengths, either of right or left Jordan chains corresponding to the eigenvalue* x_0, *are called the multiplicity of the eigenvector* r_0 *or* l_0 *and are denoted by* $m(r_0)$ *or* $m(l_0)$, *respectively.*

Proposition 3. *Given an eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$ *of a monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$, *multiplicities of right and left eigenvectors coincide and they are equal to the corresponding partial multiplicities* κ_i.

The above definition generalizes the concept of Jordan chain for degree one matrix polynomials.

Proposition 4. *The Taylor expansion of a right root polynomial* $r(x)$, *respectively of a left root polynomial* $l(x)$, *at a given eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$ *of a monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$,

$$r(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} r_j(x-x_0)^j, \qquad \textit{respectively } l(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} l_j(x-x_0)^j,$$

provides us with right Jordan chain

$$\{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{\kappa-1}\}, \qquad \textit{respectively, left Jordan chain } \{l_0, l_1, \dots, l_{\kappa-1}\}.$$

Proposition 5. *Given an eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$ *of a monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$, *with multiplicity* $s = \dim \operatorname{Ker} W(x_0)$, *we can construct* s *right root polynomials, respectively left root polynomials, for* $i \in \{1,\dots,s\}$,

$$r_i(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\kappa_i-1} r_{i,j}(x-x_0)^j, \qquad \textit{respectively } l_i(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\kappa_i-1} l_{i,j}(x-x_0)^j,$$

where $r_i(x)$ *are right root polynomials (respectively* $l_i(x)$ *are left root polynomials) with the largest order* κ_i *among all right root polynomials, whose right eigenvector does not belong to* $\mathbb{C}\{r_{0,1},\dots,r_{0,i-1}\}$ *(respectively left root polynomials whose left eigenvector does not belong to* $\mathbb{C}\{l_{0,1},\dots,l_{0,i-1}\}$*).*

Definition 4 (Canonical Jordan chains)**.** *A canonical set of right Jordan chains (respectively left Jordan chains) of the monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$ *corresponding to the eigenvalue* $x_0 \in \sigma(W(x))$ *is, in terms of the right root polynomials (respectively left root polynomials) described in Proposition 5, the following sets of vectors*

$$\{r_{1,0}\dots, r_{1,\kappa_1-1}, \dots, r_{s,0}\dots, r_{s,\kappa_r-1}\}, \qquad \textit{respectively, covectors } \{l_{1,0}\dots, l_{1,\kappa_1-1}, \dots, l_{s,0}\dots, l_{s,\kappa_r-1}\}.$$

Proposition 6. *For a monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$ *the lengths* $\{\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_r\}$ *of the Jordan chains in a canonical set of Jordan chains of* $W(x)$ *corresponding to the eigenvalue* x_0, *see Definition 4, are the nonzero partial multiplicities of* $W(x)$ *at* $x = x_0$ *described in Proposition 2.*

Definition 5 (Canonical Jordan chains and root polynomials). *For each eigenvalue $x_a \in \sigma(W(x))$ of a monic matrix polynomial $W(x)$, with multiplicity α_a and $s_a = \dim \operatorname{Ker} W(x_a)$, $a \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, we choose a canonical set of right Jordan chains, respectively left Jordan chains,*

$$\left\{ r_{j,0}^{(a)}, \dots, r_{j,\kappa_j^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \right\}_{j=1}^{s_a}, \qquad \text{respectively } \left\{ l_{j,0}^{(a)}, \dots, l_{j,\kappa_j^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \right\}_{j=1}^{s_a},$$

and, consequently, with partial multiplicities satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{s_a} \kappa_j^{(a)} = \alpha_a$. Thus, we can consider the following right root polynomials

$$r_j^{(a)}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} r_{j,l}^{(a)} (x - x_a)^l, \qquad \text{respectively left root polynomials } l_j^{(a)}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} l_{j,l}^{(a)} (x - x_a)^l. \tag{2}$$

Definition 6 (Canonical Jordan pairs). *We also define the corresponding canonical Jordan pair (X_a, J_a) with X_a the matrix*

$$X_a := \left[r_{1,0}^{(a)}, \dots, r_{1,\kappa_1^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}, \dots, r_{s_a,0}^{(a)}, \dots, r_{s_a,\kappa_{s_a}^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times \alpha_a},$$

and J_a the matrix

$$J_a := \operatorname{diag}(J_{a,1}, \dots, J_{a,s_a}) \in \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_a \times \alpha_a},$$

where $J_{a,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa_j^{(a)} \times \kappa_j^{(a)}}$ are the Jordan blocks of the eigenvalue $x_a \in \sigma(W(x))$. Then, we say that (X, J) with

$$X := \left[X_1, \dots, X_q \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times Np}, \qquad J := \operatorname{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_q) \in \mathbb{C}^{Np \times Np},$$

is a canonical Jordan pair for $W(x)$.

We have the important result, see [62],

Proposition 7. *The Jordan pairs of a monic matrix polynomial $W(x)$ satisfy*

$$A_0 X_a + A_1 X_a J_a + \cdots + A_{N-1} X_a (J_a)^{N-1} + X_a (J_a)^N = 0_{p \times \alpha_a},$$
$$A_0 X + A_1 X J + \cdots + A_{N-1} X J^{N-1} + X J^N = 0_{p \times Np}.$$

A key property, see Theorem 1.20 of [62], is

Proposition 8. *For any Jordan pair (X, J) of a monic matrix polynomial $W(x) = I_p x^N + A_{N-1} x^{N-1} + \cdots + A_0$ the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ XJ \\ \vdots \\ XJ^{N-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np \times Np}$$

is nonsingular.

Definition 7 (Jordan triple). *Given*

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 \\ \vdots \\ Y_q \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np \times p},$$

with $Y_a \in \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_a \times p}$, we say that (X, J, Y) is a Jordan triple whenever

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ XJ \\ \vdots \\ XJ^{N-1} \end{bmatrix} Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \\ I_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Moreover, Theorem 1.23 of [62], gives the following characterization

Proposition 9. *Two matrices $X \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times Np}$ and $J \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np}$ constitute a Jordan pair of a monic matrix polynomial $W(x) = I_p x^N + A_{N-1}x^{N-1} + \cdots + A_0$ if and only if the two following properties hold*

i) *The matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ XJ \\ \vdots \\ XJ^{N-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular.

ii)

$$A_0X + A_1XJ + \cdots + A_{N-1}XJ^{N-1} + XJ^N = 0_{p\times Np}.$$

Proposition 10. *Given a monic matrix polynomial $W(x)$ the adapted root polynomials given in Definition 5 satisfy*

$$\left(W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(m)} = 0, \qquad \left(l_j^{(a)}(x)W(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(m)} = 0, \qquad m \in \{0,\dots,\kappa_j^{(a)}-1\}, \qquad j \in \{1\dots,s_a\}. \tag{3}$$

Here, given a function $f(x)$ we use the following notation for its derivatives evaluated at an eigenvalue $x_a \in \sigma(W(x))$

$$(f)_{x_a}^{(m)} := \lim_{x\to x_a} \frac{d^m f}{d\,x^m}.$$

In this paper we assume that the partial multiplicities are ordered in an increasing way, i.e., $\kappa_1^{(a)} \leqslant \kappa_2^{(a)} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \kappa_{s_a}^{(a)}$.

Proposition 11. *If $r_i^{(a)}$ and $l_j^{(a)}$ are right and left root polynomials corresponding to the eigenvalue $x_a \in \sigma(W(x))$, then a polynomial*

$$w_{i,j}^{(a)}(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{d_{i,j}^{(a)}} w_{i,j;m}^{(a)} x^m \in \mathbb{C}[x], \qquad d_{i,j}^{(a)} := \kappa_{\min(i,j)}^{(a)} + N - 2,$$

exists such that

$$l_i^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x) = (x-x_a)^{\kappa_{\max(i,j)}^{(a)}} w_{i,j}^{(a)}(x). \tag{4}$$

Proof. From Proposition 10 it follows that a covector polynomial $T_1(x)$ and a vector polynomial $T_2(x)$, both of degree N, exist such that

$$l_i^{(a)}(x)W(x) = (x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}} T_1(x), \qquad W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x) = (x-x_a)^{\kappa_j^{(a)}} T_2(x). \tag{5}$$

Thus

$$l_i^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x) = (x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}} T_1(x)r_j^{(a)}(x), \qquad l_i^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x) = (x-x_a)^{\kappa_j^{(a)}} l_i^{(a)}(x)T_2(x),$$

and the result is proved. □

Definition 8 (Spectral jets)**.** *Given a matrix function $f(x)$ smooth in region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ with $x_a \in \overline{\Omega}$, a point in the closure of Ω we consider its matrix spectral jets*

$$\mathcal{J}_f^{(i)}(x_a) := \lim_{x\to x_a} \left[f(x), \dots, \frac{f^{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)}(x)}{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)!} \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p\kappa_i^{(a)}},$$

$$\mathcal{J}_f(x_a) := \left[\mathcal{J}_f^{(1)}(x_a), \dots, \mathcal{J}_f^{(s_a)}(x_a) \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p\alpha_a},$$

$$\mathcal{J}_f := \left[\mathcal{J}_f(x_1), \dots, \mathcal{J}_f(x_q) \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times Np^2},$$

and given a Jordan pair the root spectral jet vectors

$$\mathcal{J}_f^{(i)}(x_a) := \lim_{x\to x_a}\left[f(x_a)r_i^{(a)}(x_a),\dots,\frac{(f(x)r_i^{(a)}(x))_{x_a}^{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)}}{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)!}\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times\kappa_i^{(a)}}$$
$$\mathcal{J}_f(x_a) := \left[\mathcal{J}_f^{(1)}(x_a),\dots,\mathcal{J}_f^{(s_a)}(x_a)\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times\alpha_a},$$
$$\mathcal{J}_f := \left[\mathcal{J}_f(x_1),\dots,\mathcal{J}_f(x_q)\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times Np}.$$

Definition 9. *We consider the following jet matrices*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{n;i}^{(a)} := \mathcal{J}_{I_p x^n}^{(i)}(x_a) = \left[(x_a)^n r_i^{(a)}(x_a),\left(x^n r_i^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(1)},\dots,\frac{\left(x^n r_i^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)}}{(\kappa_i^{(a)}-1)!}\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times\kappa_i^{(a)}},$$
$$\mathcal{Q}_n^{(a)} := \mathcal{J}_{I_p x^n}(x_a) = \left[\mathcal{Q}_{n;1}^{(a)},\dots,\mathcal{Q}_{n;s_a}^{(a)}\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times\alpha_a},$$
$$\mathcal{Q}_n := \mathcal{J}_{I_p x^n} = \left[\mathcal{Q}_n^{(1)},\dots,\mathcal{Q}_n^{(q)}\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times Np},$$
$$\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{J}_{\chi_{[N]}} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{Q}_0\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{Q}_{N-1}\end{bmatrix}\in\mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np},$$

where $(\chi_{[N]}(x))^\top := \left[I_p,\dots,I_p x^{N-1}\right]\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times Np}[x]$.

Lemma 1 (Root spectral jets and Jordan pairs)**.** *Given a canonical Jordan pair* (X,J) *for the monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$ *we have that*

$$\mathcal{Q}_n = XJ^n,\qquad\qquad n\in\{0,1,\dots\}.$$

Thus, any polynomial $P_n(x)=\sum_{j=0}^n P_j x^j$ *has as its spectral jet vector corresponding to* $W(x)$ *the following matrix*

$$\mathcal{J}_P = P_0X + P_1XJ + \cdots + P_nXJ^{n-1}.$$

Proof. The computation

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{m!}\left(x^n r_i^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(m)} &= \frac{1}{m!}\sum_{k=0}^m\binom{m}{k}(x^n)_{x_a}^{(m-k)}\left(r_i^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(k)}\\ &= \frac{1}{m!}\sum_{k=0}^m\frac{m!}{k!(m-k)!}\frac{n!}{(n-m+k)!}(x_a)^{n-m+k}k!r_{i,k}^{(a)}\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^m\binom{n}{m-k}(x_a)^{n-m+k}r_{i,k}^{(a)}\\ &= \left[r_{i,0}^{(a)},\dots,r_{i,m}^{(a)}\right]\begin{bmatrix}(x_a)^{n-m}\binom{n}{m}\\ \vdots\\ x_a^n\binom{n}{n}\end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_{n;i}^{(a)} &= \left[r_{i,0}^{(a)},\dots,r_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}\right]\begin{bmatrix}x_a^n & x_a^{n-1}\binom{n}{1} & \cdots & x_a^{n-\kappa_i^{(a)}+1}\binom{n}{\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}\\ 0 & x_a^n & \cdots & x_a^{n-\kappa_i^{(a)}+2}\binom{n}{\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots\\ 0 & \dots & & x_a^n\end{bmatrix}\\ &= \left[r_{i,0}^{(a)},\dots,r_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}\right](J_{a,i})^n.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, in terms of the Jordan pairs associated with the right root polynomials, we have $X_a\,(J_a)^n = \mathcal{Q}_n^{(a)}$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}_n = XJ^n,$$

which is a nonsingular matrix, see Propositions 8 and 9. □

Remark 4. *From Proposition 8 we conclude that the root spectral jet of W is a zero rectangular matrix.*

Definition 10. *If $W(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} A_k x^k \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ is a matrix polynomial of degree N, we introduce the matrix*

$$\mathcal{B} := \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & A_3 & \dots & A_{N-1} & A_N \\ A_2 & A_3 & \vdots & \iddots & A_N & 0_p \\ A_3 & \dots & A_{N-1} & \iddots & 0_p & 0_p \\ \vdots & \iddots & \iddots & \iddots & & \vdots \\ A_{N-1} & A_N & 0_p & & & \\ A_N & 0_p & 0_p & & \dots & 0_p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np}.$$

Lemma 2. *Given a Jordan triple (X, J, Y) for the monic matrix polynomial $W(x)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ XJ \\ \vdots \\ XJ^{N-1} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad (\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} Y, JY, \dots, J^{N-1}Y \end{bmatrix} =: \mathcal{R}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 1 we deduce that

$$\mathcal{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ XJ \\ \vdots \\ XJ^{N-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

which is nonsingular, see Propositions 8 and 9. The biorthogonality condition (2.6) of [62] for $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is

$$\mathcal{R}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q} = I_{Np},$$

and if (X, J, Y) is a canonical Jordan triple, then

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{bmatrix} Y, JY, \dots, J^{N-1}Y \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

□

Proposition 12. *The matrix $\mathcal{R}_n := \begin{bmatrix} Y, JY, \dots, J^{n-1}Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times np}$ has full rank.*

Regarding the matrix $\mathcal{B}$,

Definition 11. *Let us consider the bivariate matrix polynomial*

$$\mathcal{V}(x, y) := \left((\chi(y))_{[N]}\right)^{\top} \mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x, y],$$

where A_j are the matrix coefficients of $W(x)$, see (1).

We consider the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials in two variables

$$h_n(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} x^j y^{n-j}.$$

For example, the first four polynomials are

$$h_0(x, y) = 1, \qquad h_1(x, y) = x + y, \qquad h_2(x, y) = x^2 + xy + y^2, \qquad h_3(x, y) = x^3 + x^2y + xy^2 + y^3.$$

Proposition 13. *In terms of complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials in two variables we can write*

$$\mathcal{V}(x,y)=\sum_{j=1}^{N}A_j h_{j-1}(x,y).$$

1.4. **On orthogonal matrix polynomials.** The polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ is a free bimodule over the ring of matrices $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ with a basis given by $\{I_p, I_p x, I_p x^2, \dots\}$. Important free bisubmodules are the sets $\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]$ of matrix polynomials of degree less than or equal to m. A basis, which has cardinality $m+1$, for $\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]$ is $\{I_p, I_p x, \dots, I_p x^m\}$; as $\mathbb{C}$ has the invariant basis number (IBN) property so does $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, see [104]. Therefore, being $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ an IBN ring, the rank of the free module $\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]$ is unique and equal to $m+1$, i.e. any other basis has the same cardinality. Its algebraic dual $\left(\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]\right)^*$ is the set of homomorphisms $\phi:\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]\to\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ which are, for the right module, of the form

$$\langle \phi, P(x)\rangle = \phi_0 p_0+\cdots+\phi_m p_m, \qquad P(x)=p_0+\cdots+p_m x^m,$$

where $\phi_k\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$. Thus, we can identify the dual of the right module with the corresponding left submodule. This dual is a free module with a unique rank, equal to $m+1$, and a dual basis $\{(I_p x^k)^*\}_{k=0}^m$ given by

$$\langle (I_p x^k)^*, I_p x^l\rangle = \delta_{k,l} I_p.$$

We have similar statements for the left module $\mathbb{C}_m^{p\times p}[x]$, being its dual a right module

$$\langle P(x), \phi\rangle = P_0\phi_0+\cdots+P_m\phi_m, \qquad \langle I_p x^l, (I_p x^k)^*\rangle = \delta_{k,l} I_p.$$

Definition 12 (Sesquilinear form)**.** *A sesquilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ on the bimodule $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ is a continuous map*

$$\begin{array}{rccc}\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle: & \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]\times\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x] & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C}^{p\times p},\\ & (P(x),Q(x)) & \mapsto & \langle P(x),Q(y)\rangle,\end{array}$$

such that for any triple $P(x),Q(x),R(x)\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ the following properties are fulfilled

i) $\langle AP(x)+BQ(x),R(y)\rangle = A\langle P(x),R(y)\rangle + B\langle Q(x),R(y)\rangle$, $\forall A,B\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$,
ii) $\langle P(x),AQ(y)+BR(y)\rangle = \langle P(x),Q(y)\rangle A^\top + \langle P(x),R(y)\rangle B^\top$, $\forall A,B\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$.

The reader probably noticed that, despite we deal with complex polynomials in a real variable, we have follow [53] and chosen the transpose instead of the Hermitian conjugated. For any couple of matrix polynomials $P(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{\deg P} p_k x^k$ and $Q(x)=\sum_{l=0}^{\deg Q} q_l x^l$ the sesquilinear form is defined by

$$\langle P(x),Q(y)\rangle = \sum_{\substack{k=1,\dots,\deg P\\ l=1,\dots,\deg Q}} p_k G_{k,l} (q_l)^\top,$$

where the coefficients are the values of the sesquilinear form on the basis of the module

$$G_{k,l}=\left\langle I_p x^k, I_p y^l\right\rangle.$$

The corresponding semi-infinite matrix

$$G=\begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots\\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots\\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}$$

is the named as the Gram matrix of the sesquilinear form.

1.4.1. *Hankel sesquilinear forms.* Now, we present a family of examples of sesquilinear forms in $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ that we call Hankel sesquilinear forms. A first example is given by matrices with complex (or real) Borel measures in $\mathbb{R}$ as entries

$$\mu = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1,1} & \cdots & \mu_{1,p} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mu_{p,1} & \cdots & \mu_{p,p} \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., a $p \times p$ matrix of Borel measures supported in $\mathbb{R}$. Given any pair of matrix polynomials $P(x), Q(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ we introduce the following sesquilinear form

$$\langle P(x), Q(x)\rangle_{\mu} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(x)\, d\,\mu(x) (Q(x))^{\top}.$$

A more general sesquilinear form can be constructed in terms of generalized functions (or continuous linear functionals). In [86, 87] a linear functional setting for orthogonal polynomials is given. We consider the space of polynomials $\mathbb{C}[x]$, with an appropriate topology, as the space of fundamental functions, in the sense of [54, 55], and take the space of generalized functions as the corresponding continuous linear functionals. It is remarkable that the topological dual space coincides with the algebraic dual space. On the other hand, this space of generalized functions is the space of formal series with complex coefficients $(\mathbb{C}[x])' = \mathbb{C}[\![x]\!]$.

In this article we use generalized functions with a well defined support and, consequently, the previously described setting requires of a suitable modification. Following [111, 54, 55], let us recall that the space of distributions is a space of generalized functions when the space of fundamental functions is constituted by the complex valued smooth functions of compact support $\mathcal{D} := C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, the so called space of test functions. In this context, the set of zeros of a distribution $u \in \mathcal{D}'$is the region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ if for any fundamental function $f(x)$ with support in Ω we have $\langle u, f\rangle = 0$. Its complement, a closed set, is what is called support, $\operatorname{supp} u$, of the distribution u. Distributions of compact support, $u \in \mathcal{E}'$, are generalized functions for which the space of fundamental functions is the topological space of complex valued smooth functions $\mathcal{E} = C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$. As $\mathbb{C}[x] \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$ we also know that $\mathcal{E}' \subsetneq (\mathbb{C}[x])' \cap \mathcal{D}'$. The set of distributions of compact support is a first example of an appropriate framework for the consideration of polynomials and supports simultaneously. More general settings appear within the space of tempered distributions $\mathcal{S}'$, $\mathcal{S}' \subsetneq \mathcal{D}'$. The space of fundamental functions is given by the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}$ of complex valued fast decreasing functions, see [111, 54, 55]. We consider the space of fundamental functions constituted by smooth functions of slow growth $\mathcal{O}_M \subset \mathcal{E}$, whose elements are smooth functions with derivatives bounded by polynomials. As $\mathbb{C}[x], \mathcal{S} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_M$, for the corresponding set of generalized functions we find that $\mathcal{O}_M' \subset (\mathbb{C}[x])' \cap \mathcal{S}'$. Therefore, these distributions give a second appropriate framework. Finally, for a third suitable framework, including the two previous ones, we need to introduce bounded distributions. Let us consider as space of fundamental functions, the linear space $\mathcal{B}$ of bounded smooth functions, i.e., with all its derivatives in $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, being the corresponding space of generalized functions $\mathcal{B}'$ the bounded distributions. From $\mathcal{D} \subsetneq \mathcal{B}$ we conclude that bounded distributions are distributions $\mathcal{B}' \subsetneq \mathcal{D}'$. Then, we consider the space of fast decreasing distributions $\mathcal{O}_c'$ given by those distributions $u \in \mathcal{D}'$ such that for each positive integer k, we have $\left(\sqrt{1+x^2}\right)^k u \in \mathcal{B}'$ is a bounded distribution. Any polynomial $P(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, with $\deg P = k$, can be written as

$$P(x) = \left(\sqrt{1+x^2}\right)^k F(x), \qquad\qquad F(x) = \frac{P(x)}{\left(\sqrt{1+x^2}\right)^k} \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Therefore, given a fast decreasing distribution $u \in \mathcal{O}_c'$ we may consider

$$\langle u, P(x)\rangle = \left\langle \left(\sqrt{1+x^2}\right)^k u, F(x) \right\rangle$$

which makes sense as $\left(\sqrt{1+x^2}\right)^k u \in \mathcal{B}', F(x) \in \mathcal{B}$. Thus, $\mathcal{O}_c' \subset (\mathbb{C}[x])' \cap \mathcal{D}'$. Moreover it can be proven that $\mathcal{O}_M' \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_c'$, see [86]. Summarizing this discussion, we have found three generalized function spaces suitable for the discussion of polynomials and supports simultaneously:

$$\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{O}_M' \subset \mathcal{O}_c' \subset \left((\mathbb{C}[x])' \cap \mathcal{D}'\right).$$

The linear functionals could have discrete and, as the corresponding Gram matrix is required to be quasidefinite, infinite support. Then, we are faced with discrete orthogonal polynomials, see for example [92]. Two classical examples are those of Charlier and the Meixner. For $\mu > 0$ we have the Charlier (or Poisson–Charlier) linear functional

$$u = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mu^k}{k!} \delta(x-k),$$

and $\beta > 0$ and $0 < c < 1$, the Meixner linear functional is

$$u = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta(\beta+1)\dots(\beta+k-1)}{k!} c^k \delta(x-k).$$

See [13] for matrix extensions of these discrete linear functionals and corresponding matrix orthogonal polynomials.

Definition 13 (Hankel sesquilinear forms)**.** *Given a matrix of generalized functions as entries*

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} u_{1,1} & \dots & u_{1,p} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{p,1} & \dots & u_{p,p} \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., $u_{i,j} \in (\mathbb{C}[x])'$*, then the associated sesquilinear form* $\langle P(x), Q(x) \rangle_u$ *is given by*

$$\left(\langle P(x), Q(x) \rangle_u \right)_{i,j} := \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \left\langle u_{k,l}, P_{i,k}(x) Q_{j,l}(x) \right\rangle.$$

When $u_{k,l} \in \mathcal{O}_c'$*, we write* $u \in \left(\mathcal{O}_c'\right)^{p\times p}$ *and say that we have a matrix of fast decreasing distributions. In this case the support is defined as* $\operatorname{supp}(u) := \cup_{k,l=1}^{N} \operatorname{supp}(u_{k,l})$*.*

Observe that in this Hankel case, we could also have continuous and discrete orthogonality.

Proposition 14. *In terms of the moments*

$$m_n := \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_{1,1}, x^n \rangle & \dots & \langle u_{1,p}, x^n \rangle \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \langle u_{p,1}, x^n \rangle & \dots & \langle u_{p,p}, x^n \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

the Gram matrix of the sesquilinear form given in Definition 13 is the following moment matrix

$$G := \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & \cdots \\ m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \cdots \\ m_2 & m_3 & m_4 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix},$$

of Hankel type.

1.4.2. *Matrices of generalized kernels and sesquilinear forms.* The previous examples all have in common the same Hankel block symmetry for the corresponding matrices. However, there are sesquilinear forms which do not have this particular Hankel type symmetry. Let us stop for a moment at this point, and elaborate on bilinear and sesquilinear forms for polynomials. We first recall some facts regarding the scalar case with $p = 1$, and bilinear forms instead of sesquilinear forms. Given $u_{x,y} \in (\mathbb{C}[x,y])' = (\mathbb{C}[x,y])^* \cong \mathbb{C}[\![x,y]\!]$, we can consider the continuous bilinear form $B(P(x), Q(y)) = \langle u_{x,y}, P(x) \otimes Q(y) \rangle$. This gives a continuous linear map $\mathcal{L}_u : \mathbb{C}[y] \to (\mathbb{C}[x])'$ such that $B(P(x), Q(y))) = \langle \mathcal{L}_u(Q(y)), P(x) \rangle$. The Gram matrix of this bilinear form has coefficients $G_{k,l} = B(x^k, y^l) = \langle u_{x,y}, x^k \otimes y^l \rangle = \langle \mathcal{L}_u(y^l), x^k \rangle$. Here we follow Schwartz discussion on kernels and distributions [110], see also [69]. A kernel $u(x,y)$ is a complex valued locally integrable function, that defines an integral operator $f(x) \mapsto g(x) = \int u(x,y) f(y)\, dy$. Following [111] we denote $(\mathcal{D})_x$ and $(\mathcal{D}')_x$ the test functions and the corresponding distributions in the variable x, and similarly for the variable y. We extend this construction considering a bivariate distribution in the variables x, y, $u_{x,y} \in (\mathcal{D}')_{x,y}$, that Schwartz called *noyau-distribution*,

and as we use a wider range of generalized functions we will call generalized kernel. This $u_{x,y}$ generates a continuous bilinear form

$$B_u\big(\phi(x),\psi(y)\big) = \langle u_{x,y}, \phi(x)\otimes\psi(y)\rangle.$$

It also generates a continuous linear map $\mathcal{L}_u : (\mathcal{D})_y \to (\mathcal{D}')_x$ with

$$\langle (\mathcal{L}_u(\psi(y)))_x, \phi(x)\rangle = \langle u_{x,y}, \phi(x)\otimes\psi(y)\rangle.$$

The Schwartz kernel theorem states that every generalized kernel $u_{x,y}$ defines a continuous linear transformation $\mathcal{L}_u$ from $(\mathcal{D})_y$ to $(\mathcal{D}')_x$, and to each of such continuous linear transformations we can associate one and only one generalized kernel. According to the prolongation scheme developed in [110], the generalized kernel $u_{x,y}$ is such that $\mathcal{L}_u : (\mathcal{E})_y \to (\mathcal{E}')_x$ if and only if the support of $u_{x,y}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is compact.[1]

We can extended these ideas to the matrix scenario of this paper, where instead of bilinear forms we have sesquilinear forms.

Definition 14. *Given a matrix of generalized kernels*

$$u_{x,y} := \begin{bmatrix} (u_{x,y})_{1,1} & \dots & (u_{x,y})_{1,p} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ (u_{x,y})_{p,1} & \dots & (u_{x,y})_{p,p} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $(u_{x,y})_{k,l} \in (\mathbb{C}[x,y])'$ *or, if a notion of support is required,* $(u_{x,y})_{k,l} \in (\mathcal{E}')_{x,y}, (\mathcal{O}'_M)_{x,y}, (\mathcal{O}'_c)_{x,y}$*, provides a continuous sesquilinear form with entries given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u\big)_{i,j} &= \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \big\langle (u_{x,y})_{k,l}, P_{i,k}(x)\otimes Q_{j,l}(y)\big\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \big\langle \mathcal{L}_{u_{k,l}}(Q_{j,l}(y)), P_{i,k}(x)\big\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{u_{k,l}} : \mathbb{C}[y] \to (\mathbb{C}[x])'$ *–or depending on the setting* $\mathcal{L}_{u_{k,l}} : (\mathcal{E})_y \to (\mathcal{E}')_x$, $\mathcal{L}_{u_{k,l}} : (\mathcal{O}_M)_y \to (\mathcal{O}'_c)_x$*, for example– is a continuous linear operator. We can condensate it in a matrix form, for* $u_{x,y} \in (\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x,y])' = (\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x,y])^* \cong \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[\![x,y]\!]$*, a sesquilinear form is given*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u &= \langle u_{x,y}, P(x)\otimes Q(y)\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{L}_u(Q(y)), P(x)\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{L}_u : \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[y] \to (\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x])'$ *a continuous linear map. Or, in other scenarios* $\mathcal{L}_u : ((\mathcal{E})_y)^{p\times p} \to ((\mathcal{E}')_x)^{p\times p}$ *or* $\mathcal{L}_u : ((\mathcal{O}_M)_y)^{p\times p} \to ((\mathcal{O}'_c)_x)^{p\times p}$.

Remark 5. *All continuous sesquilinear forms are of this type. A matrix of generalized kernels* $u_{x,y}$ *supported by the diagonal of the form* $u_{x,y} = u_{x,x}\delta(x-y)$*, gives the Hankel sesquilinear forms given in Definition 13.*

If, instead of a matrix of bivariate distributions, we have a matrix of bivariate measures then we could write for the sesquilinear form $\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle = \iint P(x)\, d\,\mu(x,y)(Q(y))^\top$, where $\mu(x,y)$ is a matrix of bivariate measures.

For the scalar case $p = 1$, Adler and van Moerbeke discussed in [2] different possibilities of non-Hankel Gram matrices. Their Gram matrix has as coefficients $G_{k,l} = \langle u_l, x^k\rangle$, for a infinite sequence of generalized functions u_l, that recovers the Hankel scenario for $u_l = x^l u$. They studied in more detail the following cases

i) Banded case: $u_{l+km} = x^{km}u_l$.
ii) Concatenated solitons: $u_l(x) = \delta(x-p_{l+1}) - (\lambda_{l+1})^2\delta(x-q_{k+1})$.
iii) Nested Calogero–Moser systems: $u_l(x) = \delta'(x-p_{l+1}) + \lambda_{l+1}\delta(x-p_{l+1})$.
iv) Discrete KdV soliton type: $u_l(x) = (-1)^k\delta^{(l)}(x-p) - \delta^{(l)}(x+p)$.

[1] Understood as a prolongation problem, see §5 in [110], we have similar results if we require $\mathcal{L}_u : \mathcal{O}_M \to \mathcal{O}'_c$ or $\mathcal{L}_u : \mathcal{O}_c \to \mathcal{O}'_c$ or any other possibility that makes sense for polynomials and support.

We see that the three last weights are generalized functions. To compare with the Schwartz's approach we observe that $\langle u_{x,y}, x^k \otimes y^l \rangle = \langle u_l, x^k \rangle$ and, consequently, we deduce $u_l = \mathcal{L}_u(y^l)$ (and for continuous kernels $u_l(x) = \int u(x,y) y^l \, \mathrm{d}\, y$). The first case, has a banded structure and its Gram matrix fulfills $\Lambda^m G = G(\Lambda^\top)^m$. In [9] different examples are discussed for the matrix orthogonal polynomials, like bigraded Hankel matrices $\Lambda^n G = G\left(\Lambda^\top\right)^m$, where n, m are positive integers, can be realized as $G_{k,l} = \langle u_l, I_p x^k \rangle$, in terms of matrices of linear functionals u_l which satisfy the following periodicity condition $u_{l+m} = u_l x^n$. Therefore, given the linear functionals $u_0, \dots, u_{m-1}$ we can recover all the others.

1.4.3. *Sesquilinear forms supported by the diagonal and Sobolev sesquilinear forms.* First we consider the scalar case

Definition 15. *A generalized kernel $u_{x,y}$ is supported by the diagonal $y = x$ if*

$$\langle u_{x,y}, \phi(x,y) \rangle = \sum_{n,m} \left\langle u_x^{(n,m)}, \frac{\partial^{n+m} \phi(x,y)}{\partial x^n \partial y^m}\Big|_{y=x} \right\rangle$$

for a locally finite sum and generalized functions $u_x^{(n,m)} \in (\mathcal{D}')_x$.

Proposition 15 (Sobolev bilinear forms)**.** *The bilinear form corresponding to a generalized kernel supported by the diagonal is*

$$B(\phi(x), \psi(x)) = \sum_{n,m} \left\langle u_x^{(n,m)}, \phi^{(n)}(x) \psi^{(m)}(x) \right\rangle,$$

which is of Sobolev type,

For order zero $u_x^{(n,m)}$ generalized functions, i.e. for a set of Borel measures $\mu^{(n,m)}$, we have

$$B(\phi(x), \psi(x)) = \sum_{n,m} \int \phi^{(n)}(x) \psi^{(m)}(x) \, \mathrm{d}\, \mu^{(n,m)}(x),$$

which is of Sobolev type. Thus, in the scalar case, generalized kernels supported by the diagonal are just Sobolev bilinear forms. The extension of these ideas to the matrix case is immediate, we only need to require to all generalized kernels to be supported by the diagonal.

Proposition 16 (Sobolev sesquilinear forms)**.** *A matrix of generalized kernels supported by the diagonal provides Sobolev sesquilinear forms*

$$\left(\langle P(x), Q(x) \rangle_u\right)_{i,j} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \sum_{n,m} \left\langle u_{k,l}^{(n,m)}, P_{i,k}^{(n)}(x) Q_{j,l}^{(m)}(x) \right\rangle.$$

for a locally finite sum, in the of derivatives order n, m, and of generalized functions $u_x^{(n,m)} \in (\mathbb{C}[x])'$. All Sobolev sesquilinear forms are obtained in this form.

For a recent review on scalar Sobolev orthogonal polynomials see [84]. Observe that with this general framework we could consider matrix discrete Sobolev orthogonal polynomials, that will appear whenever the linear functionals $u^{(m,n)}$ have infinite discrete support, as far as u is quasidefinite.

1.4.4. *Biorthogonality, quasidefiniteness and Gauss–Borel factorization.*

Definition 16 (Biorthogonal matrix polynomials)**.** *Given a sesquilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, two sequences of matrix polynomials $\left\{P_n^{[1]}(x)\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $\left\{P_n^{[2]}(x)\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are said to be biorthogonal with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ if*

i) $\deg(P_n^{[1]}(x)) = \deg(P_n^{[2]}(x)) = n$ *for all* $n \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$,
ii) $\left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), P_m^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle = \delta_{n,m} H_n$ *for all* $n, m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$,

where H_n are nonsingular matrices and $\delta_{n,m}$ is the Kronecker delta.

Definition 17 (Quasidefiniteness). *A Gram matrix of a sesquilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is said to be quasidefinite whenever* $\det \mathsf{G}_{[k]} \neq 0$, $k \in \{0,1,\dots\}$. *Here* $\mathsf{G}_{[k]}$ *denotes the truncation*

$$\mathsf{G}_{[k]} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{G}_{0,0} & \dots & \mathsf{G}_{0,k-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathsf{G}_{k-1,0} & \dots & \mathsf{G}_{k-1,k-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We say that the bivariate generalized function $\mathfrak{u}_{x,y}$ is quasidefinite and the corresponding sesquilinear form is nondegenerate whenever its Gram matrix is quasidefinite.

Proposition 17 (Gauss–Borel factorization, see [15]). *If the Gram matrix of a sesquilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is quasidefinite, then there exists a unique Gauss–Borel factorization given by*

$$\mathsf{G} = (\mathsf{S}_1)^{-1}\mathsf{H}(\mathsf{S}_2)^{-\top}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathsf{S}_1, \mathsf{S}_2$ are lower unitriangular block matrices and H is a diagonal block matrix

$$\mathsf{S}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{I}_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ (\mathsf{S}_i)_{1,0} & \mathsf{I}_p & 0_p & \cdots \\ (\mathsf{S}_i)_{2,0} & (\mathsf{S}_i)_{2,1} & \mathsf{I}_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad i = 1,2, \qquad \mathsf{H} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathsf{H}_0, \mathsf{H}_1, \mathsf{H}_2, \dots),$$

with $(\mathsf{S}_i)_{n,m}$ and $\mathsf{H}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, $\forall n, m \in \{0,1,\dots\}$.

Remark 6. *Despite that* (7) *involve the product of three semi-infinite matrices, and therefore of series* –infinite sums– *could appear, this is not the case, as, given the order of the factors, lower unitriangular, diagonal and upper unitriangular, all the sums are finite; following* [26] *we could say that is an* admissible *product.*

Remark 7. *The product of semi-infinite matrices is not associative in general, see* [32]. *Hence, special care is required in the manipulations of the Gauss–Borel factorization problem.*

Remark 8 (See [32]). *Lower unitriangular semi-infinite matrices have a unique inverse matrix, which is again lower unitriangular. The product of lower triangular semi-infinite matrices or the product of upper triangular semi-infinite matrices is associative.*

Following [26] we have

Definition 18. *Block of lower (upper) Hessenberg type matrices are semi-infinite matrices with finite number of nonzero block superdiagonals (subdiagonals).*

Also we have the block version of Proposition 2.3 [26]

Proposition 18 (See [26]). *The associative property* $(AB)C = A(BC)$ *of a product of three semi-infinite block matrices* A, B *and* C *hold whenever*

i) *Both* A *and* B *are of block lower Hessenberg type.*
ii) *Both* B *and* C *are block upper Hessenberg type.*
iii) *If* A *is block lower Hessenberg type and* C *is block upper Hessenberg type.*

For $l \geqslant k$ we will also use the following bordered truncated Gram matrix

$$\mathsf{G}^{[1]}_{[k,l]} := \left[\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{G}_{0,0} & \cdots & \mathsf{G}_{0,k-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathsf{G}_{k-2,0} & \cdots & \mathsf{G}_{k-2,k-1} \\ \hline \mathsf{G}_{l,0} & \dots & \mathsf{G}_{l,k-1} \end{array}\right],$$

where we have replaced the last row of blocks of the truncated Gram matrix $\mathsf{G}_{[k]}$ by the row of blocks $[\,\mathsf{G}_{l,0},\dots,\mathsf{G}_{l,k-1}\,]$. We also need a similar matrix but replacing the last block column of $\mathsf{G}_{[k]}$ by a column of blocks as indicated

$$\mathsf{G}^{[2]}_{[k,l]} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{G}_{0,0} & \cdots & \mathsf{G}_{0,k-2} & \mathsf{G}_{0,l} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathsf{G}_{k-1,0} & \cdots & \mathsf{G}_{k-1,k-2} & \mathsf{G}_{k-1,l} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using last quasideterminants, see [56, 99], we find

Proposition 19. *If the last quasideterminants of the truncated moment matrices are nonsingular, i.e.,*

$$\det \Theta_*(G_{[k]}) \neq 0, \qquad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

then, the Gauss–Borel factorization can be performed and the following expressions are fulfilled

$$H_k = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots & G_{0,k-1} \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots & G_{1,k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ G_{k-1,0} & G_{k-1,1} & \dots & G_{k-1,k-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(S_1)_{k,l} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots & G_{0,k-1} & 0_p \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots & G_{1,k-1} & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ G_{l-1,0} & G_{l,1} & \dots & G_{l-1,k-1} & 0_p \\ G_{l,0} & G_{l,1} & \dots & G_{l,k-1} & I_p \\ G_{l+1,0} & G_{l+1,1} & \dots & G_{l+1,k-1} & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ G_{k,0} & G_{k,1} & \dots & G_{k,k-1} & 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left((S_2)^\top\right)_{k,l} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots & G_{0,l-1} & G_{0,l} & G_{0,l+1} & \dots & G_{0,k} \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots & G_{1,l-1} & G_{1,l} & G_{1,l+1} & \dots & G_{1,k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ G_{k-1,0} & G_{k-1,1} & \dots & G_{k-1,l-1} & G_{k-1,l} & G_{k-1,l+1} & \dots & G_{k-1,k} \\ 0_p & 0_p & \dots & 0_p & I_p & 0_p & \dots & 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

and for the inverse elements [99] *the formulas*

$$(S_1^{-1})_{k,l} = \Theta_*(G^{[1]}_{[k,l+1]})\Theta_*(G_{[l+1]})^{-1},$$
$$(S_2^{-1})_{k,l} = \left(\Theta_*(G_{[l+1]})^{-1}\Theta_*(G^{[2]}_{[k,l+1]})\right)^\top,$$

hold true.

We see that the matrices H_k are quasideterminants, and following [16, 15] we refer to them as quasitau matrices.

1.4.5. *Biorthogonal polynomials, second kind functions and Christoffel–Darboux kernels.*

Definition 19. *We define* $\chi(x) := [I_p, I_p x, I_p x^2, \dots]^\top$, *and for* $x \neq 0$, $\chi^*(x) := [I_p x^{-1}, I_p x^{-2}, I_p x^{-3}, \dots]^\top$.

Remark 9. *Observe that the Gram matrix can be expressed as*

$$G = \langle \chi(x), \chi(y) \rangle_u = \langle u_{x,y}, \chi(x) \otimes \chi(y) \rangle \tag{8}$$

and its block entries are

$$G_{k,l} = \left\langle I_p x^k, I_p y^l \right\rangle_u.$$

If the sesquilinear form derives from a matrix of bivariate measures $\mu(x, y) = [\mu_{i,j}(x, y)]$ *we have for the Gram matrix blocks*

$$G_{k,l} = \iint x^k \, d\,\mu(x, y) y^l.$$

which reduces for absolutely continuous measures with respect the Lebesgue measure $d\,x\,d\,y$ *to a matrix of weights* $w(x, y) = [w_{i,j}(x, y)]$, *and When the matrix of generalized kernels is Hankel we recover the classical Hankel structure, and the Gram matrix is a moment matrix. For example, for a matrix of measures we will have* $G_{k,l} = \int x^{k+l} \, d\,\mu(x)$.

Definition 20. *Given a quasidefinite matrix of generalized kernels $\mathfrak{u}_{x,y}$ and the Gauss–Borel factorization* (17) *of its Gram matrix, the corresponding first and second families of matrix polynomials are*

$$P^{[1]}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ P_1^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} := S_1\chi(x), \qquad P^{[2]}(y) = \begin{bmatrix} P_0^{[2]}(y) \\ P_1^{[2]}(y) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} := S_2\chi(y), \tag{9}$$

respectively. The corresponding first and second families of second kind functions á la Gram are

$$C^{[1]}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0^{[1]}(x) \\ C_1^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} := H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top}\chi^*(x), \qquad C^{[2]}(y) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0^{[2]}(y) \\ C_1^{[2]}(y) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} := H^\top\big(S_1\big)^{-\top}\chi^*(y), \tag{10}$$

respectively, whenever the series involved converge.

Remark 10. *The matrix polynomials $P_n^{[i]}(x)$ are monic and $\deg P_n^{[i]}(x) = n$, $i = 1, 2$.*

Remark 11. *We see that the second kind functions á la Gram implies non admissible products, in the sense of* [26]*, however we will see that the series involved do converge, in some general situations, to certain Cauchy transformations of the biorthogonal families of matrix polynomials.*

Proposition 20 (Biorthogonality)**.** *Given a quasidefinite matrix of generalized kernels $\mathfrak{u}_{x,y}$, the first and second families of monic matrix polynomials $\{P_n^{[1]}(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{P_n^{[2]}(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are biorthogonal*

$$\Big\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), P_m^{[2]}(y)\Big\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} = \delta_{n,m}H_n, \qquad n, m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}. \tag{11}$$

Remark 12. *The biorthogonal relations yield the orthogonality relations*

$$\Big\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^m I_p\Big\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} = 0_p, \qquad \Big\langle x^m I_p, P_n^{[2]}(y)\Big\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} = 0_p, \qquad m \in \{1, \dots n-1\}, \tag{12}$$

$$\Big\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^n I_p\Big\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} = H_n, \qquad \Big\langle x^n I_p, P_n^{[2]}(y)\Big\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} = H_n. \tag{13}$$

Remark 13 (Symmetric generalized kernels)**.** *If $\mathfrak{u}_{x,y} = (\mathfrak{u}_{y,x})^\top$, the Gram matrix is symmetric $G = G^\top$ and we are dealing with a Cholesky block factorization with $S_1 = S_2$ and $H = H^\top$. Now $P_n^{[1]}(x) = P_n^{[2]}(x) =: P_n(x)$, and $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a set of monic orthogonal matrix polynomials. In this case $C_n^{[1]}(x) = C_n^{[2]}(x) =: C_n(x)$.*

The shift matrix is the following semi-infinite block matrix

$$\Lambda := \begin{bmatrix} 0_p & I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ 0_p & 0_p & I_p & 0_p & \ddots \\ 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & I_p & \ddots \\ 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

which satisfies the spectral property

$$\Lambda\chi(x) = x\chi(x).$$

Next results are useful to ensure that the manipulations related with the Gauss–Borel factorization and semi-infinite matrices do respect certain associativity properties.

Proposition 21. *For the next first three properties we assume a quasidefinite Gram matrix G with Gauss–Borel factorization $G = (S_1)^{-1}H(S_2)^{-\top}$*

i) *For any matrix polynomial $W(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$*

$$GW(\Lambda^\top) = (S_1)^{-1}H\Big((S_2)^{-\top}W\big(\Lambda^\top\big)\Big),$$
$$W(\Lambda)G = \Big(W(\Lambda)(S_1)^{-1}\Big)H(S_2)^{-\top}.$$

ii) *Given a semi-infinite vector* $X = \left[X_0, X_1, \ldots\right]^\top$, *with* $X_n \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ *and, whenever the series involved in the products* $(S_2)^{-\top}X$ *and* $X^\top(S_1)^{-1}$ *converge, we have*

$$GX = (S_1)^{-1}H\big((S_2)^{-\top}X\big), \qquad X^\top G = \big(X^\top(S_1)^{-1}\big)H(S_2)^{-\top}.$$

Consequently,

$$S_1(GX) = H\big((S_2)^{-\top}X\big), \qquad (X^\top G)(S_2)^\top = \big(X^\top(S_1)^{-1}\big)H.$$

iii) *Let us now relax the quasidefinite condition and only assume that* $(GW(\Lambda^\top))X$ *or* $G(W(\Lambda^\top)X)$ *involves only convergent series, then* $(GW(\Lambda^\top))X = G(W(\Lambda^\top)X)$. *Similarly, if* $X^\top(W(\Lambda)G)$ *or* $(X^\top W(\Lambda))G$ *involves only convergent series, then* $X^\top(W(\Lambda)G) = (X^\top W(\Lambda))G$.

iv) *As above, we relax the quasidefinite condition and only assume that* GX, *respectively* $X^\top G$, *involves solely convergent series, then* $W(\Lambda)(GX) = (W(\Lambda)G)X$, *respectively* $(X^\top G)W(\Lambda^\top) = X^\top(GW(\Lambda^\top))$.

Proof. We will use the notation $L := (S_1)^{-1} = (l_{i,j})$ and $U := H(S_2)^{-\top} = (u_{i,j})$. Then, we write

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ l_{1,0} & I_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ l_{2,0} & l_{2,1} & I_p & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ 0_p & u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ 0_p & 0_p & u_{2,2} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,0} & l_{1,0}u_{0,1}+u_{1,1} & l_{1,0}u_{0,2}+u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,0} & l_{2,0}u_{0,1}+l_{2,1}u_{1,1} & l_{2,,0}u_{0,2}+l_{2,1}u_{1,2}+u_{2,2} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}.$$

i) It is enough to check it for $W(\Lambda^\top) = \Lambda^\top$. On the one hand

$$G\Lambda^\top = \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,0} & l_{1,0}u_{0,1}+u_{1,1} & l_{1,0}u_{0,2}+u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,0} & l_{2,0}u_{0,1}+l_{2,1}u_{1,1} & l_{2,,0}u_{0,2}+l_{2,1}u_{1,2}+u_{2,2} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ 0_p & I_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,1}+u_{1,1} & l_{1,0}u_{0,2}+u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,1}+l_{2,1}u_{1,1} & l_{2,,0}u_{0,2}+l_{2,1}u_{1,2}+u_{2,2} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix};$$

i.e., we shift all columns one position to the left. On the other hand, we compute

$$L(U\Lambda^\top) = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ l_{1,0} & I_p & 0_p & \ldots \\ l_{2,0} & l_{2,1} & I_p & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ 0_p & u_{3,3} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \ldots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,1}+u_{1,1} & l_{1,0}u_{0,2}+u_{1,2} & \ldots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,1}+l_{2,1}u_{1,1} & l_{2,,0}u_{0,2}+l_{2,1}u_{1,2}+u_{2,2} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix},$$

and we obtain the desired result.

ii) We first compute $\mathsf{U}X = \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0}X_0+u_{0,1}X_1+\cdots \\ u_{1,1}X_1+u_{1,2}X_2+\cdots \\ u_{2,2}X_2+u_{2,3}X_3+\cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}$, where we assumed that all the series involved, $\mathsf{U}_n := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u_{n,m}X_m$, do converge. Then, we have

$$\mathsf{L}(\mathsf{U}X) = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ l_{1,0} & I_p & 0_p & \dots \\ l_{2,0} & l_{2,1} & I_p & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{U}_0 \\ \mathsf{U}_1 \\ \mathsf{U}_2 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{U}_0 \\ l_{1,0}\mathsf{U}_0 + \mathsf{U}_1 \\ l_{2,0}\mathsf{U}_0 + l_{2,1}\mathsf{U}_1 + \mathsf{U}_2 \\ \cdots \end{bmatrix}$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{G}X &= \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & \dots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,0} & l_{1,0}u_{0,1} + u_{1,1} & l_{1,0}u_{0,2} + u_{1,2} & \dots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,0} & l_{2,0}u_{0,1} + l_{2,1}u_{1,1} & l_{2,,0}u_{0,2} + l_{2,1}u_{1,2} + u_{3,3} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ X_1 \\ X_2 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} u_{0,0}X_0 + u_{0,1}X_1 + u_{0,2}X_2 + \cdots \\ l_{1,0}u_{0,0}X_0 + (l_{1,0}u_{0,1} + u_{1,1})X_1 + (l_{1,0}u_{0,2} + u_{1,2})X_2 + \cdots \\ l_{2,0}u_{0,0}X_0 + (l_{2,0}u_{0,1} + l_{2,1}u_{1,1})X_1 + (l_{2,,0}u_{0,2} + l_{2,1}u_{1,2} + u_{2,2})X_3 + \cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{U}_0 \\ l_{1,0}\mathsf{U}_0 + \mathsf{U}_1 \\ l_{2,0}\mathsf{U}_0 + l_{2,1}\mathsf{U}_1 + \mathsf{U}_2 \\ \cdots \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last identity we have used the fact that the series involved do converge and, therefore, a finite linear combination of convergent series gives the convergent series of the corresponding finite linear combination of its coefficients.

iii) To illustrate the idea of the proof we just check the case $W(x) = I_p x$. Then, as we realized before, the matrix $\mathsf{G}\Lambda^\top$ is obtained shifting left all columns in G

$$(\mathsf{G}\Lambda^\top)X = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,1} & G_{0,2} & \dots \\ G_{1,1} & G_{1,2} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ X_1 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,1}X_0 + G_{0,2}X_1 + \cdots \\ G_{1,1}X_0 + G_{1,2}X_1 + \cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix},$$

and we suppose that all series $G_{j,1}X_0 + G_{j,2}X_1 + \cdots$ converge for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. But,

$$\mathsf{G}(\Lambda^\top X) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_p \\ X_0 \\ X_1 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,1}X_0 + G_{0,2}X_1 + \cdots \\ G_{1,1}X_0 + G_{1,2}X_1 + \cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix},$$

and the statement follows.

iv) Again we just check one case, $\Lambda(\mathsf{G}X) = (\Lambda\mathsf{G})X$:

$$\mathsf{G}X = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \dots \\ G_{0,1} & G_{1,1} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ X_1 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0}X_0 + G_{0,1}X_1 + \cdots \\ G_{1,0}X_0 + G_{1,1}X_1 + \cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix},$$

so that $\Lambda(GX) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{1,0}X_0+G_{1,1}X_1+\cdots \\ G_{2,0}X_0+G_{2,1}X_1+\cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}$. But,

$$(\Lambda G)X = \begin{bmatrix} G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \dots \\ G_{2,1} & G_{2,1} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ X_1 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{1,0}X_0 + G_{1,1}X_1 + \cdots \\ G_{2,0}X_0 + G_{2,1}X_1 + \cdots \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix},$$

as claimed.

□

Proposition 22. *The symmetry of the block Hankel moment matrix reads* $\Lambda G = G\Lambda^\top$.

Notice that this symmetry completely characterizes Hankel block matrices.

Definition 21. *The matrices* $J_1 := S_1\Lambda(S_1)^{-1}$ *and* $J_2 := S_2\Lambda(S_2)^{-1}$ *are the Jacobi matrices associated with the Gram matrix* G.

The reader must notice the abuse in the notation. But for the sake of simplicity we have used the same letter for Jacobi and Jordan matrices. The type of matrix will be clear from the context.

Remark 14. *Let us observe that there is no problem with the definition related with the associativity problems of semi-infinite matrices, as one can readily check that for any couple of lower unitriangular matrices* L_1, L_2 *we have* $(L_1\Lambda)L_2 = L_1(\Lambda L_2)$. *Moreover, if* L_3 *is a third lower unitriangular matrix, we have* $(L_1\Lambda L_2)L_3 = (L_1\Lambda)(L_2L_3)$.

Proposition 23. *The biorthogonal polynomials are eigenvectors of the Jacobi matrices*

$$J_1P^{[1]}(x) = xP^{[1]}(x), \qquad J_2P^{[2]}(x) = xP^{[2]}(x).$$

and the second kind functions á la Gram satisfy

$$\big(H(J_2)^\top H^{-1}\big)C^{[1]}(x) = xC^{[1]}(x) - H_0\begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \big(H^\top (J_1)^\top H^{-\top}\big)C^{[2]}(x) = xC^{[2]}(x) - H_0^\top\begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Let us check the first relation

$$\begin{aligned} J_1P^{[1]}(x) &= (S_1\Lambda(S_1)^{-1})(S_1\chi(x)) = \big((S_1\Lambda)(S_1)^{-1}\big)(S_1\chi(x)) \\ &= (S_1\Lambda)((S_1)^{-1}S_1\chi(x)) = (S_1\Lambda)\chi(x). \end{aligned}$$

For the second kind functions we give a very detailed chain of relations, in where in every step we have carefully checked associative aspects of the operations performed (otherwise, it will take a couple of lines) a make heavy use of Propositions 18 and 21

$$\begin{aligned} \big(H(J_2)^\top H^{-1}\big)C^{[1]}(x) &= \Big(H\big((S_2)^{-\top}\Lambda^\top(S_2)^\top\big)H^{-1}\Big)\big(H(S_2)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)\big) = \big(\big(HS_2^{-\top}\Lambda^\top\big)\big((S_2)^\top H^{-1}\big)\big(H(S_2)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)\big) \\ &= (HS_2^{-\top}\Lambda^\top)\Big(\big((S_2)^\top H^{-1}\big)\big(H(S_2)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)\big)\Big) = (HS_2^{-\top}\Lambda^\top)\chi^*(x) \\ &= \big(HS_2^{-\top}\big)(\Lambda^\top\chi^*(x)) \\ &= x\big(HS_2^{-\top}\big)\chi^*(x) - x\big(HS_2^{-\top}\big)\begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= xC^{[1]}(x) - x\begin{bmatrix} H_0 \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 15. *For the Hankel case we have*

$$J_1 C^{[1]}(x) = xC^{[1]}(x) - H_0 \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad J_2 C^{[2]}(x) = xC^{[2]}(x) - H_0^\top \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proposition 24. *For Hankel type Gram matrices (i.e., associated with a matrix of univariate generalized functionals) the two Jacobi matrices are related by*

$$H^{-1} J_1 = J_2^\top H^{-1},$$

being, therefore, a tridiagonal matrix. This yields the three term relation for biorthogonal polynomials and second kind functions, respectively.

Proof. The relation between the two Jacobi matrices follows from the Gauss–Borel factorization in the symmetry $\Lambda G = G\Lambda^\top$. A consequence of this relation is the three-block-diagonal shape of these matrices. The three term relations follow from the definitions of the Jacobi matrices in terms of the factorization matrices. There are not associative issues in this case and Propositions 18 and 21 ensure all the mentioned arguments. □

Proposition 25. *We have the following last quasideterminantal expressions*

$$P_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \cdots & G_{0,n-1} & I_p \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \cdots & G_{1,n} - 1 & I_p x \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ G_{n-1,0} & G_{n-1,1} & \cdots & G_{n-1,n-1} & I_p x^{n-1} \\ G_{n,0} & G_{n,1} & \cdots & G_{n,n-1} & I_p x^n \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} G_{0,0} & G_{0,1} & \cdots & G_{0,n-1} & G_{0,n} \\ G_{1,0} & G_{1,1} & \cdots & G_{1,n-1} & G_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ G_{n-1,0} & G_{n-1,1} & \cdots & G_{n-1,n-1} & G_{n-1,n} \\ I_p & I_p y & \cdots & I_p y^{n-1} & I_p y^n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Definition 22 (Christoffel–Darboux kernel,[113, 33])**.** *Given two sequences of matrix biorthogonal polynomials*

$$\left\{P_k^{[1]}(x)\right\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ and } \left\{P_k^{[2]}(y)\right\}_{k=0}^\infty,$$

with respect to the sesquilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_u$, we define the n-th Christoffel–Darboux kernel matrix polynomial

$$K_n(x,y) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} (P_k^{[2]}(y))^\top (H_k)^{-1} P_k^{[1]}(x), \tag{14}$$

and the mixed Christoffel–Darboux kernel

$$K_n^{(pc)}(x,y) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(P_k^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top (H_k)^{-1} C_k^{[1]}(x).$$

Proposition 26. i) *For a quasidefinite matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y}$, the corresponding Christoffel–Darboux kernel gives the projection operator*

$$\left\langle K_n(x,z), \sum_{0\leqslant j\ll\infty} C_j P_j^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u = \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{n} C_j P_j^{[2]}(z) \Big)^\top, \quad \left\langle \sum_{0\leqslant j\ll\infty} C_j P_j^{[1]}(x), (K_n(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_u = \sum_{j=0}^{n} C_j P_j^{[1]}(z). \tag{15}$$

ii) *In particular, we have*

$$\left\langle K_n(x,z), I_p y^l \right\rangle_u = I_p z^l, \qquad l \in \{0,1,\dots,n\}. \tag{16}$$

Proof. It follows from the biorthogonality (11). □

Proposition 27 (Christoffel–Darboux formula)**.** *When the sesquilinear form is Hankel (now $\mathfrak{u}$ is a matrix of univariate generalized functions with its Gram matrix of block Hankel type) the Christoffel–Darboux kernel satisfies*

$$(x-y)K_n(x,y) = (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top (H_n)^{-1} P_{n+1}^{[1]}(x) - (P_{n+1}^{[2]}(y))^\top (H_n)^{-1} P_n^{[1]}(x),$$

and the mixed Christoffel-Darboux kernel fulfills

$$(x-y)K_n^{(pc)}(x,y) = (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top H_n^{-1} C_{n+1}^{[1]}(x) - (P_{n+1}^{[2]}(y))^\top H_n^{-1} C_n^{[1]}(x) + I_p.$$

Proof. We only prove the second formula, for the first one proceeds similarly. It is obviously a consequence of the three term relation. Firstly, let us notice that

$$J_2^\top H^{-1} C^{[1]}(x) = xH^{-1}C^{[1]}(x) - \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad (P^{[2]}(y))^\top J_2^\top H^{-1} = y(P^{[2]}(y))^\top H^{-1}.$$

Secondly, we have

$$J_2^\top H^{-1} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} & & & & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ & \left[J_2^\top H^{-1}\right]_{[n]} & & & \vdots & \vdots & \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ & & & & H_n^{-1} & 0 & \dots \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & H_n^{-1} & & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & & * & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & & \end{array}\right].$$

Using this, we calculate the $\left(P_{[n]}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \left[J_2^\top H^{-1}\right]_{[n]} C_{[n]}^{[1]}(x)$, first by computing the action of middle matrix on its left and then on its right to get

$$xK_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y) - (P_{n-1}^{[2]}(y))^\top H_n^{-1} C_n^{[1]}(x) - P_0 = yK_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y) - (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top H_n^{-1} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x),$$

and since $P_0 = I_p$ the Proposition is proven. □

Next, we deal with the fact that our definition of second kind functions implies non admissible products and do involve series.

Definition 23. *For the support of the matrix of generalized kernels $\operatorname{supp}(\mathfrak{u}_{x,y}) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ we consider the action of the component projections $\pi_1, \pi_2 : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ on its first and second variables, $(x,y) \overset{\pi_1}{\mapsto} x$, $(x,y) \overset{\pi_2}{\mapsto} y$, respectively, and introduce the projected supports $\operatorname{supp}_x(\mathfrak{u}) := \pi_1\big(\operatorname{supp}(\mathfrak{u}_{x,y})\big)$ and $\operatorname{supp}_y(\mathfrak{u}) := \pi_2\big(\operatorname{supp}(\mathfrak{u}_{x,y})\big)$, both subsets of $\mathbb{C}$. We will assume that $r_x := \sup\{|z| : z \in \operatorname{supp}_x \mathfrak{u}\}) < \infty$ and $r_y := \sup\{|z| : z \in \operatorname{supp}_y \mathfrak{u}\}) < \infty$ We also consider the disks about infinity, or annulus around the origin, $D_x := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > r_x\}$ and $D_y := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > r_y\}$.*

Proposition 28. *Whenever the matrix of generalized kernels is such that $\mathfrak{u}_{x,y} \in \left((\mathcal{O}_c')_{x,y}\right)^{p\times p}$, the second kind functions á la Gram can be expressed as*

$$C_n^{[1]}(z) = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}}, \qquad |z| > r_y,$$

$$\left(C_n^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}}, \qquad |z| > r_x.$$

Proof. From (10), the Gauss–Borel factorization (7) and Proposition 21 we get

$$C^{[1]}(z) = S_1\big(G\chi^*(z)\big), \qquad \left(C^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \left(\left(\chi^*(z)\right)^\top G\right)\left(S_2\right)^\top,$$

which recalling (8) can be written as

$$C^{[1]}(z) = S_1\langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} \chi^*(z), \qquad \left(C^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \left(\chi^*(z)\right)^\top \langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\rangle_{\mathfrak{u}} \left(S_2\right)^\top.$$

Using the properties of a sesquilinear form and (9) we find

$$C^{[1]}(z) = \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_u \chi^*(z), \qquad \left(C^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \left(\chi^*(z)\right)^\top \langle \chi(x), P^{[2]}(y)\rangle_u.$$

Finally, as z belongs to a disk about ∞ with empty intersection with $\operatorname{supp}_y(u)$, taking into account the uniform convergence in any compact subset in this disk about infinity of the geometric series $\left(\chi^*(z)\right)^\top \chi(y) = \dfrac{I_p}{z-y}$, we deduce the result. □

When the matrix of generalized kernels is a matrix of bivariate measures, for z outside a disk containing the projected support, $\operatorname{supp}_y \mu(x,y)$, we get

$$C_n^{[1]}(z) = \int P_n^{[1]}(x) d\mu(x,y) \frac{1}{z-y}, \qquad \left(C_n^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \int \frac{1}{z-x} d\mu(x,y) \left(P_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top,$$

and when the sesquilinear form is Hankel it reduces to the following Hankel type second kind functions

$$C_n^{[1]}(z) = \int P_n^{[1]}(x) d\mu(x) \frac{1}{z-x}, \qquad \left(C_n^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \int \frac{1}{z-x} d\mu(x) \left(P_n^{[2]}(x)\right)^\top.$$

Definition 24 (Second kind functions á la Cauchy)**.** *For a generalized kernels is such that* $u_{x,y} \in \left((\mathcal{O}_c')_{x,y}\right)^{p\times p}$ *we define two families of second kind functions á la Cauchy given by*

$$C_n^{[1]}(z) = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_u, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_y(u),$$
$$\left(C_n^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top = \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_x(u).$$

Remark 16. *The second kind functions á la Cauchy can be considered as an extension of their Gram version. Hereon we will consider the second kind functions in its Cauchy version.*

2. Matrix Geronimus transformations

Geronimus transformations for scalar orthogonal polynomials were first discussed in [58], where some determinantal formulas were found, see [128, 88]. Geronimus perturbations of degree two of scalar bilinear forms have been very recently treated in [40] and in the general case in [41]. Here we discuss its matrix extension for general sesquilinear forms.

Definition 25. *Given a matrix of generalized kernels* $u_{x,y} = ((u_{x,y})_{i,j}) \in \left((\mathcal{O}_c')_{x,y}\right)^{p\times p}$ *with a given support* $\operatorname{supp} u_{x,y}$*, and a matrix polynomial* $W(y) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[y]$ *of degree* N*, such that* $\sigma(W(y)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_y(u) = \varnothing$*, a matrix of bivariate generalized functions* $\check{u}_{x,y}$ *is said to be a matrix Geronimus transformation of the matrix of generalized kernels* $u_{x,y}$ *if*

$$\check{u}_{x,y} W(y) = u_{x,y}. \tag{17}$$

Proposition 29. *In terms of sesquilinear forms a Geronimus transformation fulfills*

$$\left\langle P(x), Q(y)(W(y))^\top \right\rangle_{\check{u}} = \langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u,$$

while, in terms of the corresponding Gram matrices, satisfies

$$\check{G} W(\Lambda^\top) = G.$$

Remark 17. *Given our non-Abelian scenario is, in principle, reasonable to propose the alternative following Geronimus perturbation* $\left\langle P(x), (W(y))^\top Q(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}} = \langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u$*, but we immediately realize that this perturbation will not respect the sesquilinearity and, consequently, has nonsense.*

We will assume that the perturbed moment matrix has a Gauss–Borel factorization $\check{G} = \check{S}_1^{-1}\check{H}(\check{S}_2)^{-\top}$, where $\check{S}_1, \check{S}_2$ are lower unitriangular block matrices and $\check{H}$ is a diagonal block matrix

$$\check{S}_i = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ (\check{S}_i)_{1,0} & I_p & 0_p & \cdots \\ (\check{S}_i)_{2,0} & (\check{S}_i)_{2,1} & I_p & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \qquad \check{H} = \operatorname{diag}(\check{H}_0, \check{H}_1, \check{H}_2, \dots).$$

Hence, the Geronimus transformation provides the family of matrix biorthogonal polynomials

$$\check{P}^{[1]}(x) = \check{S}_1\chi(x), \qquad \check{P}^{[2]}(y) = \check{S}_2\chi(y),$$

with respect to the perturbed sesquilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\check{u}}$.

Observe that the matrix generalized kernels $\nu_{x,y}$ such that $\nu_{x,y}W(y) = 0_p$, can be added to a Geronimus transformed matrix of generalized kernels $\check{u}_{x,y} \mapsto \check{u}_{x,y} + \nu_{x,y}$, to get a new Geronimus transformed matrix of generalized kernels. We call masses these type of terms.

2.1. **The resolvent and connection formulas.**

Definition 26. *The resolvent matrix is*

$$\omega := \check{S}_1(S_1)^{-1}. \tag{18}$$

The key role of this resolvent matrix is determined by the following properties

Proposition 30. i) *The resolvent matrix can be also expressed as*

$$\omega = \check{H}\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W(\Lambda^\top)\big(S_2\big)^\top H^{-1}, \tag{19}$$

where the products in the RHS are associative.

ii) *The resolvent matrix is a lower unitriangular block banded matrix —with only the first* N *block subdiagonals possibly not zero, i.e.,*

$$\omega = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & \dots & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ \omega_{1,0} & I_p & \ddots & 0_p & 0_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \omega_{N,0} & \omega_{N,1} & \dots & I_p & 0_p & \ddots \\ 0_p & \omega_{N+1,1} & \cdots & \omega_{N+1,N} & I_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

iii) *The following connection formulas are satisfied*

$$\check{P}^{[1]}(x) = \omega P^{[1]}(x), \tag{20}$$

$$\big(\check{H}^{-1}\omega H\big)^\top \check{P}^{[2]}(y) = P^{[2]}(y)W^\top(y). \tag{21}$$

iv) *For the last subdiagonal of the resolvent we have*

$$\omega_{N+k,k} = \check{H}_{N+k}A_N(H_k)^{-1}. \tag{22}$$

Proof. i) From Proposition 29 and the Gauss–Borel factorization of G and $\check{G}$ we get

$$\big(S_1\big)^{-1}H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top} = \Big(\big(\check{S}_1\big)^{-1}\check{H}\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top}\Big)W(\Lambda^\top),$$

from Proposition 21 we deduce

$$\big(S_1\big)^{-1}H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top} = \big(\check{S}_1\big)^{-1}\check{H}\Big(\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W(\Lambda^\top)\Big),$$

and Proposition 18, as well as the associativity and invertibility properties of lower and upper unitriangular matrices, we get

$$\check{S}_1(S_1)^{-1}H = \check{H}(\check{S}_2)^{-\top}W(\Lambda^\top)(S_2)^\top.$$

It is easily check that the RHS products are associative.

ii) The resolvent matrix, being a product of lower unitriangular matrices, is a lower unitriangular matrix. However, from (19) we deduce that is a matrix with all its subdiagonals with zero coefficients but for the first N. Thus, it must have the described band structure.

iii) From the definition we have (20). Let us notice that (19) can be written as

$$\omega^\top\check{H}^{-\top} = H^{-\top}S_2W^\top(\Lambda)(\check{S}_2)^{-1},$$

so that

$$\omega^\top\check{H}^{-\top}\check{P}^{[2]}(y) = H^{-\top}S_2W^\top(\Lambda)\chi(y),$$

and (21) follows.

iv) It is a consequence of (19).

□

The connection formulas (20) and (21) can be written as

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = P_n^{[1]}(x) + \sum_{k=n-N}^{n-1}\omega_{n,k}P_k^{[1]}(x), \tag{23}$$

$$W(y)\big(P_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top(H_n)^{-1} = \big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top(\check{H}_n)^{-1} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+N}\big(\check{P}_k^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top(\check{H}_k)^{-1}\omega_{k,n}. \tag{24}$$

Lemma 3. *We have that*

$$W(\Lambda^\top)\chi^*(x) = \chi^*(x)W(x) - \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

with $\mathcal{B}$ given in Definition 10.

Proof. It is a direct consequence of $\big(\Lambda^\top\big)^n\chi(x) = x^n\chi^*(x) - \begin{bmatrix}x^nI_p\\ \vdots\\ I_p\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix}$. □

Proposition 31. *The Geronimus transformation of the second kind functions satisfies*

$$\check{C}^{[1]}(x)W(x) - \begin{bmatrix}\big(\check{H}(\check{S}_2)^{-\top}\big)_{[N]}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix} = \omega C^{[1]}(x), \tag{26}$$

$$\big(\check{C}^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top\check{H}^{-1}\omega = \big(C^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top H^{-1}. \tag{27}$$

Proof. • **á la Cauchy** To get (26) we argue as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\check{C}^{[1]}(z)W(z) - \omega C^{[1]}(z) &= \left\langle\check{P}_1(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\check{u}}W(z) - \left\langle\check{P}_1(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\check{u}W} && \text{use (20) and (17)}\\ &= \left\langle\check{P}_1(x), \frac{W(z)-W(y)}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\check{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

But, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{W(z)-W(y)}{z-y} &= I_p\frac{z^N-y^N}{z-y}+A_{N-1}\frac{z^{N-1}-y^{N-1}}{z-y}+\cdots+A_1\\ &= I_p h_{N-1}(z,y)+A_{N-1}h_{N-2}(z,y)+\cdots+A_1\\ &= (\chi(y))^\top\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(z))_N\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\check{C}^{[1]}(z)W(z)-\omega C^{[1]}(z) &= \check{S}_1\left\langle\chi(x),\chi(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}}\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(z))_N\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\\ &= \check{S}_1\check{G}\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_N\\ 0\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

and using the Gauss–Borel factorization the result follows. For (27) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\check{C}^{[2]}(x)\right)^\top\check{H}^{-1}\omega-\left(C^{[2]}(x)\right)^\top H^{-1} &= \left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},\check{P}^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}}\check{H}^{-1}\omega-\left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_u H^{-1}\\ &= \left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},\left(\check{H}^{-1}\omega\right)^\top\check{P}^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}}-\left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},H^{-\top}P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_u\\ &= \left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},H^{-\top}P^{[2]}(y)(W(y))^\top\right\rangle_{\check{u}}-\left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},H^{-\top}P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_u\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

- **á la Gram** This proof is included to show how the connection formulas can be derived directly from the Gauss–Borel factorization. From (10), and taking care of the potential associative problems with semi-infinite matrices, we find the chain of relations (recall that we assume that $(S_2)^{-\top}\chi_2^*$ involve only convergent series)

$$\begin{aligned}\omega C^{[1]}(x) &= \left(\check{S}_1(S_1)^{-1}\right)\left(H\left(S_2\right)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)\right)=\check{S}_1\left((S_1)^{-1}\left(H\left(S_2\right)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)\right)\right)\\ &= \check{S}_1\left(G\chi^*(x)\right)=\check{S}_1\left(\left(\check{G}W(\Lambda^\top)\right)\chi^*(x)\right).\end{aligned}$$

But, taking into account (25) and the assumption that $\check{G}\chi^*(x)$ do involve only convergent series, we conclude that $\check{G}\left(W(\Lambda^\top)\chi^*(x)\right)$ involve only convergent series and therefore $\left(\check{G}W(\Lambda^\top)\right)\chi^*(x)=\check{G}\left(W(\Lambda^\top)\chi^*(x)\right)$. Consequently, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\omega C^{[1]}(x) &= \check{S}_1\left(\check{G}\left(W(\Lambda^\top)\chi^*(x)\right)\right)\\ &= \check{S}_1\left(\check{G}\left(\chi^*(x)W(x)-\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix}\right)\right)\\ &= \check{S}_1\left(\left((\check{S}_1)^{-1}\check{H}(\check{S}_2)^{-\top}\right)\left(\chi^*(x)W(x)-\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix}\right)\right)\\ &= \check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\chi^*(x)W(x)-\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix}\\ &= \check{C}^{[1]}(x)W(x)-\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

and (26) follows. Finally, (27) is a consequence of

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\check{C}^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}^{-1}\omega H &= \big(\check{C}^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}^{-1}\check{S}_1\big(S_1\big)^{-1}H = \big(\chi^*(y)\big)^{\top}\big(S_1\big)^{-1}H\\ &= \big(C^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that the corresponding entries are

$$\big(C_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}(H_k)^{-1} = \big(\check{C}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}(\check{H}_n)^{-1} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+N}\big(\check{C}_k^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}(\check{H}_k)^{-1}\omega_{n,k}. \tag{28}$$

2.2. **Geronimus transformations and Christoffel–Darboux kernels.**

Definition 27. *The resolvent wing is the matrix*

$$\Omega[n] = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{n,n-N} & \dots & \dots & \omega_{n,n-1}\\ 0_p & \ddots & & \vdots\\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots\\ 0_p & \dots & 0_p & \omega_{n+N-1,n-1}\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np}, & n \geqslant N,\\ \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{n,0} & \dots & \dots & \omega_{n,n-1}\\ \vdots & & & \vdots\\ \omega_{N,0} & & & \omega_{N,n-1}\\ 0_p & \ddots & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots\\ 0_p & \dots & 0_p & \omega_{n+N-1,n-1}\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times np}, & n < N.\end{cases}$$

Theorem 1. *For $m = \min(n, N)$, the perturbed and original Christoffel–Darboux kernels are related by the following connection formula*

$$\check{K}_{n-1}(x,y) = W(y)K_{n-1}(x,y) - \Big[\big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_n^{-1},\dots,\big(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\Big]\,\Omega[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_{n-m}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}. \tag{29}$$

For $n \geqslant N$, the connection formula for the mixed Christoffel–Darboux kernels is

(30)

$$\check{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)W(x) = W(y)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y) - \Big[\big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_n^{-1},\dots,\big(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\Big]\,\Omega[n]\begin{bmatrix}C_{n-N}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{V}(x,y),$$

where $\mathcal{V}(x,y)$ was introduced in Definition 11.

Proof. For the first connection formula (29) we consider the pairing

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y) := \Big[\big(\check{P}_0^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}(\check{H}_0)^{-1},\cdots,\big(\check{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\Big]\,\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix}P_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and compute it in two different ways. From (23) we get

$$\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix} P_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}=\begin{bmatrix} \check{P}_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ \check{P}_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and, therefore, $\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y)=\check{K}_{n-1}(x,y)$. Relation (24) leads to

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y)=W(y)K_{n-1}(x,y)-\left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_n)^{-1},\dots,\left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n+N-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix} P_{n-m}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and (29) is proven.

To derive (30) we consider the pairing

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y):=\left[\left(\check{P}_0^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_0)^{-1},\dots,\left(\check{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix} C_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

which, as before, can be computed in two different forms. On the one hand, using (26) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)&=\left[\left(\check{P}_0^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_0)^{-1},\dots,\left(\check{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\left(\begin{bmatrix} \check{C}_0^{[1]}(x)W(x)\\ \vdots \\ \check{C}_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)W(x)\end{bmatrix}-\left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N]}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}\right)\\ &=\check{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)W(x)-\left((\chi(y))_{[n]}\right)^{\top}\left(\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{\top}\check{H}^{-1}\right)_{[n]}\left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N]}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]},\end{aligned}$$

where $\left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N]}$ is the truncation to the n first block rows and first N block columns of $\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}$. This simplifies for $n\geqslant N$ to

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)=\check{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)W(x)-\left((\chi(y))_{[N]}\right)^{\top}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}.$$

On the other hand, from (24) we conclude

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)=W(y)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)-\left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_n)^{-1},\dots,\left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n+N-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix} C_{n-N}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and, consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\check{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)W(x)=W(y)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y)&-\left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_n)^{-1},\dots,\left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^{\top}(\check{H}_{n+N-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix} C_{n-N}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots \\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}\\ &+\left((\chi(y))_{[N]}\right)^{\top}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]}.\end{aligned}$$

□

2.3. **Spectral jets and relations for the perturbed polynomials and its second kind functions.** For the time being we will assume that the perturbing polynomial is monic, $W(x)=I_p x^N+\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}A_k x^k\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$.

Definition 28. *Given a perturbing monic matrix polynomial $W(y)$ the most general mass term will have the form*

$$\nu_{x,y}:=\sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{j=1}^{s_a}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1}\frac{(-1)^m}{m!}\left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x\otimes\delta^{(m)}(y-x_a)l_j^{(a)}(y), \tag{31}$$

expressed in terms of derivatives of Dirac linear functionals and adapted left root polynomials $\mathfrak{l}_j^{(a)}(x)$ *of* $W(x)$*, and for vectors of generalized functions* $\left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x \in \left((\mathbb{C}[x])'\right)^p$ *. Discrete Hankel masses appear when these terms are supported by the diagonal with*

$$\nu_{x,x} := \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{s_a} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} (-1)^m \delta^{(m)}(x - x_a) \frac{\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}}{m!} \mathfrak{l}_j^{(a)}(x), \tag{32}$$

with $\xi_{j,m}^{[a]} \in \mathbb{C}^p$*.*

Remark 18. *Observe that the Hankel masses* (32) *are particular cases of* (31) *with*

$$\nu_{x,y} := \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{s_a} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} (-1)^m \frac{\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}}{m!} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} \delta^{(m-k)}(x - x_a) \otimes \delta^{(k)}(y - x_a) \mathfrak{l}_j^{(a)}(y),$$

so that, with the particular choice in (31)

$$\left(\xi_{j,k}^{[a]}\right)_x = \sum_{n=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1-k} (-1)^n \frac{\xi_{j,k+n}^{[a]}}{n!} \delta^{(n)}(x - x_a),$$

we get the diagonal case.

Remark 19. *For the sesquilinear forms we have*

$$\langle P(x), Q(y) \rangle_{\check{u}} = \left\langle P(x), Q(y)(W(y))^{-\top} \right\rangle_u + \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{s_a} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} \left\langle P(x), \left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \frac{1}{m!} \left(\mathfrak{l}_j^{(a)}(y) \left(Q(y)\right)^{\top}\right)_{x_a}^{(m)}.$$

Observe that the distribution $\nu_{x,y}$ is associated with the eigenvalues and left root vectors of the perturbing polynomial $W(x)$. Needless to say that, when $W(x)$ has a singular leading coefficient, this spectral part could even disappear, for example if $W(x)$ is unimodular; i.e., with constant determinant, not depending on x. Notice that, in general, we have $Np \geqslant \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \kappa_j^{(a)}$ and we can not ensure the equality, up to for the nonsingular leading coefficient case.

Definition 29. *Given a set of generalized functions* $(\xi_{i,m}^{[a]})_x$*, we introduce the matrices*

$$\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle := \left[\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{i,0}^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{i,1}^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times \kappa_i^{(a)}},$$

$$\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi^{[a]})_x \right\rangle := \left[\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_1^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_2^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{s_a}^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times \alpha_a},$$

$$\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle := \left[\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi^{[1]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi^{[2]}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{s_a}^{[q]}\right)_x \right\rangle \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times Np}.$$

Definition 30. *The exchange matrix is*

$$\eta_i^{(a)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \iddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa_i^{(a)} \times \kappa_i^{(a)}}.$$

Definition 31. *The left Jordan chain matrix is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)} := \begin{bmatrix} l_{i,0}^{(a)} & l_{i,1}^{(a)} & l_{i,2}^{(a)} & \dots & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \\ 0_{1\times p} & l_{i,0}^{(a)} & l_{i,1}^{(a)} & \dots & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}^{(a)} \\ 0_{1\times p} & 0_{1\times p} & l_{i,0}^{(a)} & \dots & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-3}^{(a)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{1\times p} & 0_{1\times p} & & & l_{i,0}^{(a)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa_i^{(a)}\times p\kappa_i^{(a)}}.$$

For $z \neq x_a$, we also introduce the $p \times p$ matrices

$$\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z) := \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \eta_i^{(a)} \mathcal{L}_i^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{I_p}{(z-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{z-x_a} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

where $i = 1, \dots, s_a$.

Remark 20. *Assume that the mass matrix is as in* (32)*. Then, in terms of*

$$\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)} := \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{[a]} & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}^{[a]} & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-3}^{[a]} & \dots & \xi_{i,0}^{[a]} \\ 0_{p\times 1} & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{[a]} & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}^{[a]} & \dots & \xi_{i,1}^{[a]} \\ 0_{p\times 1} & 0_{p\times 1} & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{[a]} & \dots & \xi_{i,2}^{[a]} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{p\times 1} & 0_{p\times 1} & & & \xi_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{[a]} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\kappa_i^{(a)}\times\kappa_i^{(a)}}, \tag{34}$$

we can write

$$\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \eta_i^{(a)} = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}(x_a)\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}. \tag{35}$$

Consequently,

$$\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z) := \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}(x_a)\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{I_p}{(z-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{z-x_a} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\kappa_i^{(a)}\times p\kappa_i^{(a)}}$ is a block upper triangular matrix, with blocks in $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$.

Proposition 32. *Fo $z \notin \operatorname{supp}_y(\check{u}) = \operatorname{supp}_y(u) \cup \sigma(W(y))$, the following expression*

$$\check{C}_n^{[1]}(z) = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} + \sum_{a=0}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z)$$

holds.

Proof. From Proposition 28 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{C}_n^{[1]}(z) &= \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} + \sum_{a=0}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_a}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_i^{(a)}-1} \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_{j,m}^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \left(\frac{1}{m!}\frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{z-x} \right)^{(m)}_{x_a}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking into account that

$$\left(\frac{1}{m!}\frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{z-x}\right)^{(m)}_{x=x_a}=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\left(\frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{(m-k)!}\right)^{(m-k)}_{x_a}\frac{1}{(z-x_a)^{k+1}},$$

we deduce the result. □

Lemma 4. *Let* $r_j^{(a)}(x)$ *be right root polynomials of the monic matrix polynomial* $W(x)$ *given in* (2)*, then*

$$\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix}W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x)=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{1}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{1}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix}l_i^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x)+(x-x_a)^{\kappa_j^{(a)}}T(x),\quad T(x)\in\mathbb{C}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}}[x].$$

Proof. Notice that we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix}W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x)&=\begin{bmatrix}l_{i,0}^{(a)} & l_{i,1}^{(a)} & l_{i,2}^{(a)} & \cdots & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}\\ 0_{1\times p} & l_{i,0}^{(a)} & l_{i,1}^{(a)} & \cdots & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}^{(a)}\\ 0_{1\times p} & 0_{1\times p} & l_{i,0}^{(a)} & & l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-3}^{(a)}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots\\ 0_{1\times p} & 0_{1\times p} & & & l_{i,0}^{(a)}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix}W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x)\\ &=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}}-l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{l_i^{(a)}(x)}{x-x_a}-l_{i,1}^{(a)}-\cdots-l_{i,\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)}(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}-2}\end{bmatrix}W(x)r_j^{(a)}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Now, (5) yields the result. □

Lemma 5. *The function* $\check{c}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(b)}(x)\in\mathbb{C}^p[x]$ *satisfies*

$$\check{c}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(b)}(x)=\begin{cases}\left\langle\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x),(\xi_i^{[a]})_x\right\rangle\eta_i^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}(x-x_a)^{\kappa_{\max(i,j)}^{(a)}-\kappa_i^{(a)}}\\ \vdots\\ (x-x_a)^{\kappa_{\max(i,j)}^{(a)}-1}\end{bmatrix}w_{i,j}^{(a)}(x)+(x-x_a)^{\kappa_j^{(a)}}T^{(a,a)}(x), & \text{if } a=b,\\ (x-x_b)^{\kappa_j^{(b)}}T^{(a,b)}(x), & \text{if } a\neq b,\end{cases}\tag{36}$$

where the $\mathbb{C}^p$*-valued function* $T^{(a,b)}(x)$ *is analytic at* $x=x_b$ *and, in particular,* $T^{(a,a)}(x)\in\mathbb{C}^p[x]$ *.*

Proof. First, for the function $\check{c}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(b)}(x)\in\mathbb{C}^p[x]$, with $a\neq b$, and recalling (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\check{c}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W(x)r_j^{(b)}(x)&=\left\langle\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x),(\xi_i^{[a]})_x\right\rangle\eta_i^{(a)}\mathcal{L}_i^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix}W(x)r_j^{(b)}(x)\\ &=(x-x_b)^{\kappa_j^{(b)}}T^{(a,b)}(x),\end{aligned}$$

where the $\mathbb{C}^{p}$-valued function $T^{(a,b)}(x)$ is analytic at $x = x_b$. Secondly, from (33) and Lemma 4 we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}_{n;i}(x)W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x) &= \left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi^{[a]}_{i})_{x}\right\rangle \eta^{(a)}_{i}\mathcal{L}^{(a)}_{i}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_i}}\\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix} W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x)\\ &= \left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi^{[a]}_{i})_{x}\right\rangle \eta^{(a)}_{i}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_i}}\\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_a}\end{bmatrix} l^{(a)}_{i}(x)W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x)\\ &\quad + (x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_j}\left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi^{[a]}_{i})_{x}\right\rangle \eta^{(a)}_{i}T^{(a,a)}(x),\end{aligned}$$

for some $T^{(a,a)}(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p}[x]$. Therefore, from Proposition 11 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}_{n;i}(x)W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x) &= \left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi^{[a]}_{i})_{x}\right\rangle \eta^{(a)}_{i}\begin{bmatrix}(x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_{\max(i,j)}-\kappa^{(a)}_i}\\ \vdots \\ (x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_{\max(i,j)}-1}\end{bmatrix}\\ &\quad\times\left(w^{(a)}_{i,j;0}+w^{(a)}_{i,j;1}(x-x_a)+\cdots+w^{(a)}_{i,j;\kappa^{(a)}_{\min(i,j)}+N-2}(x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_{\min(i,j)}+N-2}\right).\\ &\quad + (x-x_a)^{\kappa^{(a)}_j}\left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi^{[a]}_{i})_{x}\right\rangle \eta^{(a)}_{i}T^{(a,a)}(x),\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. □

We evaluate now the spectral jets of the second kind functions $\check{C}^{[1]}(z)$ á la Cauchy, thus we must take limits of derivatives precisely in points of the spectrum of $W(x)$, which do not lay in the region of definition but on the border of it. Notice that these operations are not available for the second kind functions á la Gram.

Lemma 6. *For* $m = 0, \dots, \kappa^{(a)}_j - 1$, *the following relations hold*

$$\left(\check{C}^{[1]}_{n}(z)W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_a}\left(\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(a)}_{n;i}(z)W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}. \tag{37}$$

Proof. For $z \notin \operatorname{supp}_y(u) \cup \sigma(W(y))$, a consequence of Proposition 32 is that

$$\left(\check{C}^{[1]}_{n}(z)W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a} = \left(\left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a} + \sum_{b=0}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_b}\left(\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}_{n;i}(z)W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}.$$

But, as $\sigma(W(y)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_y(u) = \varnothing$, the derivatives of the Cauchy kernel $1/(z-y)$ are analytic functions at $z = x_a$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a} &= \left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), \left(\frac{W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)}{z-y}\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}\right\rangle_{uW^{-1}}\\ &= \left\langle \check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x), \sum_{k=0}^{m}\binom{m}{k}\left(W(z)r^{(a)}_{j}(z)\right)^{(k)}_{x_a}\frac{(-1)^{m-k}(m-k)!}{(x_a-y)^{m-k+1}}\right\rangle_{uW^{-1}}\\ &= 0_{p\times 1},\end{aligned}$$

for $m = 1, \dots, \kappa^{(a)}_j - 1$, where in the last equation we have used (5). Equation (36) shows that $\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}_{n;i}(x)W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x)$ for $b \neq a$ has a zero at $z = x_a$ of order $\kappa^{(a)}_j$ and, consequently,

$$\left(\check{\mathcal{C}}^{(b)}_{n;i}(x)W(x)r^{(a)}_{j}(x)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a} = 0, \qquad b \neq a,$$

for $m = 0, \dots, \kappa_j^{(a)} - 1$. □

Definition 32. *Given the functions $w_{i,j;k}^{(a)}$ introduced in Proposition 11, let us introduce the matrix $\mathcal{W}_{j,i}^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa_j^{(a)} \times \kappa_i^{(a)}}$*

$$\mathcal{W}_{j,i}^{(a)} := \begin{cases} \eta_j^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} & w_{i,j;0}^{(a)} & w_{i,j;1}^{(a)} & \cdots & w_{i,j;\kappa_j^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \\ 0_{\kappa_j^{(a)} \times (\kappa_i^{(a)} - \kappa_j^{(a)})} & 0_p & w_{i,j:0}^{(a)} & \cdots & w_{i,j;\kappa_j^{(a)}-2}^{(a)} \\ & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & 0_p & 0_p & & w_{i,j:0}^{(a)} \end{bmatrix}, & i \geqslant j, \\ \eta_j^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} w_{i,j;\kappa_j^{(a)}-\kappa_i^{(i)}}^{(a)} & w_{i,j;\kappa_j^{(a)}-\kappa_i^{(i)}+1}^{(a)} & \cdots & w_{i,j,\kappa_j^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ w_{i,j;0}^{(a)} & w_{i,j;1}^{(a)} & \cdots & w_{i,j;\kappa_i^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \\ 0_p & w_{i,j;0}^{(a)} & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0_p & 0_p & & w_{i,j;0}^{(a)} \end{bmatrix}, & i \leqslant j. \end{cases}$$

and the matrix $\mathcal{W}_j^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa_j^{(a)} \times \alpha_a}$ given by

$$\mathcal{W}_j^{(a)} := \left[\mathcal{W}_{j,1}^{(a)}, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{j,s_a}^{(a)} \right].$$

We also consider the matrices $\mathcal{W}^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_a \times \alpha_a}$ and $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np \times Np}$

$$\mathcal{W}^{(a)} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1^{(a)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{W}_{s_a}^{(a)} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{W} := \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{W}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{W}^{(q)}). \tag{38}$$

Proposition 33. *The following relations among the spectral jets, introduced in Definition 8, of the perturbed polynomials and second kind functions*

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W}(x_a) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W}(x_a), \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W}(x_a) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \mathcal{J}_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W}(x_a), \tag{39}$$

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W}(x_a) = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{i,j}^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W}(x_a) = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_i^{(a)}, \tag{40}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W}(x_a) = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W} = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}, \tag{41}$$

are satisfied.

Proof. Equation (39) is a direct consequence of (37). According to (36) for $m = 0, \dots, \kappa_j^{(a)} - 1$, we have

$$\left(\check{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x) W(x) r_j^{(a)}(x) \right)^{(m)}_{x = x_a} = \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \eta_i^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \left((x - x_a)^{\kappa_{\max(i,j)}^{(a)} - \kappa_i^{(a)}} w_{i,j}^{(a)}(x) \right)^{(m)}_{x_a} \\ \vdots \\ \left((x - x_a)^{\kappa_{\max(i,j)}^{(a)} - 1} w_{i,j}^{(a)}(x) \right)^{(m)}_{x_a} \end{bmatrix},$$

and collecting all these equations in a matrix form we get (40). Finally, we notice that from (39) and (40) we deduce

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W}(x_a) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{i,j}^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]} W}(x_a) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_i^{(a)}.$$

Now, using (38) we can write the second equation as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]}W}(x_a) &= \sum_{i=1}^{s_a} \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi_i^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_i^{(a)} \\ &= \left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi^{[a]})_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}^{(a)}.\end{aligned}$$

A similar argument leads to the second relation in (41). □

Definition 33. *For the Hankel masses, we also consider the matrices* $\mathcal{T}_i^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\kappa_i^{(a)}\times\alpha_a}$, $\mathcal{T}^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\alpha_a\times\alpha_a}$ *and* $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np^2\times Np}$ *given by*

$$\mathcal{T}_i^{(a)} := \mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\eta_i^{(a)}\mathcal{W}_i^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{T}^{(a)} := \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{T}_1^{(a)}\\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{T}_{s_a}^{(a)}\end{bmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{T} := \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{T}^{(1)},\dots,\mathcal{T}^{(q)}).$$

Remark 21. *For masses as in* (32)*, relations* (40) *and* (41) *reduce to*

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\check{C}_{n;i}W}(x_a) = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}(x_a)\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\eta_i^{(a)}\mathcal{W}_{i,j}^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_{n;i}W}(x_a) = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}(x_a)\mathcal{T}_i^{(a)},$$
$$\mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]}W}(x_a) = \mathcal{J}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}(x_a)\mathcal{T}^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]}W} = \mathcal{J}_{\check{P}_n^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}.$$

2.4. **Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas.** We assume a mass term as in (31).

2.4.1. *Discussion for* $n \geqslant N$.

Remark 22. *First, we perform a preliminary comment. Later on, see Corollary 1, with the aid of a nonspectral approach, we will see that*

$$\begin{vmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{vmatrix} \neq 0, \qquad n \geqslant N.$$

Proposition 34. *If* $n \geqslant N$*, the matrix coefficients of the connection matrix satisfy*

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] = -\left(\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\right) \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Proof. From the connection formula (26), for $n \geqslant N$

$$\check{C}_n^{[1]}(x)W(x) = \sum_{k=n-N}^{n-1} \omega_{n,k}C_k^{[1]}(x) + C_n^{[1]}(x),$$

and we conclude that

$$\mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_n^{[1]}W} = \left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}}\end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}}.$$

Similarly, using the equation (23), we get

$$\left\langle \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} = \left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix}\left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix} + \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}. \tag{42}$$

Now, from (41) we deduce

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}\end{bmatrix}+\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}=\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}+\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W},$$

that is to say

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}=-\Big(\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\Big).$$

Hence, using Remark 22 we get the result. □

Remark 23. *In the next results, the jets of the Christoffel–Darboux kernels are considered with respect to the first variable* x*, and we treat the* y*-variable as a parameter.*

Theorem 2 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas)**.** *When* $n\geqslant N$*, for monic Geronimus perturbations, with masses as described in* (31)*, we have the following last quasideterminantal expressions for the perturbed biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its matrix norms*

$$\check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x)=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x)\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & P^{[1]}_{n}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

$$\check{H}_n=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & H_{n-N}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N+1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & 0_p\end{bmatrix},$$

$$\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_{n}(y)\big)^{\top}=-\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & H_{n-N}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N+1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W} & 0_p\\ W(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{K^{(pc)}_{n-1}(y)}-\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\,\mathcal{W}\big)+\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y) & 0_p\end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. First, we consider the expressions for $\check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x)$ and $\check{H}_n$. Using relation (23) we have

$$\check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x)=P^{[1]}_{n}(x)+\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

from Proposition 34 we obtain

$$\check{P}^{[1]}_{n}(x)=P^{[1]}_{n}(x)-\big(\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\big)\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and the result follows. To get the transformation for the H's we proceed as follows. From (22) we deduce

$$\check{H}_n = \omega_{n,n-N} H_{n-N}. \tag{43}$$

But, according to Proposition 34, we have

$$\omega_{n,n-N} = -\left(\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$\check{H}_n = -\left(\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} H_{n-N} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now prove the result for $\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top$. On one hand, according to Definition 14 we rewrite (30) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\check{P}_k^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_k^{-1} \check{C}_k^{[1]}(x) W(x) = {} & W(y) K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y) \\ & - \left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_n^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} C_{n-N}^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{V}(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the corresponding spectral jets do satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\check{P}_k^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_k^{-1} \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_k^{[1]} W} = {} & W(y) \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) \\ & - \left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_n^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y), \end{aligned}$$

and, recalling (41), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\check{P}_k^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_k^{-1} \left\langle \check{P}_k^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} = {} & W(y) \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) \\ & - \left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_n^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-N}^{[1]}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

On the other hand, from (29) we realize that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\check{P}_k^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_k^{-1} \left\langle P_k^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ & \quad = W(y) \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,y), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} - \left[\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_n^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\check{P}_{n+N-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top \check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} \left\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be subtracted to (44) to get

$$W(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y)-\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\,\mathcal{W}\big)+\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y)$$
$$=\Big[\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_n^{-1},\dots,\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_{n+N-1}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\Big]\,\Omega[n]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, we obtain the formula

$$\Big[\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_n^{-1},\dots,\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_{n+N-1}(y)\big)^{\top}\check{H}_{n+N-1}^{-1}\Big]\,\Omega[n] \tag{45}$$
$$=\Big(W(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y)-\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\,\mathcal{W}\big)+\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y)\Big)\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Now, for $n\geqslant N$, from Definition 27 and the fact that $\omega_{n,n-N}=\check{H}_n\big(H_{n-N}\big)^{-1}$, we get

$$\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\big)^{\top}=\Big(W(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y)-\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\,\mathcal{W}\big)+\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y)\Big)\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}H_{n-N}\\ 0_p\\ \vdots\\ 0_p\end{bmatrix},$$

and the result follows. □

Remark 24 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas with discrete masses supported by the diagonal)**.** *When $n\geqslant N$, for monic Geronimus perturbations, with masses as described in* (32)*, we have the following last quasideterminantal expressions for the perturbed biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its matrix norms*

$$\check{P}^{[1]}_n(x)=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-N}}\mathcal{T} & P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x)\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n}}\mathcal{T} & P^{[1]}_{n}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$
$$\check{H}_n=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-N}}\mathcal{T} & H_{n-N}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}\mathcal{T} & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n}}\mathcal{T} & 0_p\end{bmatrix},$$
$$\big(\check{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\big)^{\top}=-\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-N}}\mathcal{T} & H_{n-N}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-N+1}}\mathcal{T} & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}}-\mathcal{J}_{P^{[1]}_{n-1}}\mathcal{T} & 0_p\\ W(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y)-\mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}(y)\mathcal{T}\big)+\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}}(y) & 0_p\end{bmatrix}.$$

2.4.2. *Discussion for* $n<N$. Later on, in the context of nonspectral methods, we will derive Corollary 2, which is applicable in our monic polynomial perturbation scenario. Thus, we know that $\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_0}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_0(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_n}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_n(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}$ is full rank.

Proposition 35. *The truncations* $\omega_{[N]}$, $\check{H}_{[N]}$, *and* $(\check{S}_2)_{[N]}$ *yield the Gauss–Borel factorization*

$$\left(\omega_{[N]}\right)^{-1}\check{H}_{[N]}\left((\check{S}_2)_{[N]}\right)^{-\top} = -\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{N-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{N-1}^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}\mathcal{R},$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ *is given in* (6).

Proof. From (26) we deduce

$$\left(\check{C}^{[1]}(z)\right)_{[N]}W(z) - \left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[N]}\mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]} = \omega_{[N]}\left(C^{[1]}(z)\right)_{[N]},$$

so that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_0^{[1]}W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{\check{C}_{N-1}^{[1]}W}\end{bmatrix} - \left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[N]}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q} = \omega_{[N]}\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{N-1}^{[1]}}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Recalling (41) we deduce

$$\begin{bmatrix} \left\langle \check{P}_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \left\langle \check{P}_{N-1}^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix} - \left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[N]}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q} = \omega_{[N]}\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{N-1}^{[1]}}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, using (23), we conclude

$$-\left(\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[N]} = \omega_{[N]}\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C_{N-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{N-1}^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}\end{bmatrix}\left(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}\right)^{-1}, \tag{46}$$

and the result is proven. □

From Proposition 35 and the corresponding explicit quasideterminantal expressions for its solution we get

Lemma 7. *For* $n \in \{0,1,\dots,N-1\}$ *and* $0 \leqslant k < n$,

$$\check{H}_n = -\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n\end{bmatrix},$$

$$\omega_{n,k} = \Theta_*\begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n & \\ \vdots & e_k \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n & \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left((\check{S}_2)^{\top}\right)_{n,k} = \Theta_*\begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ (e_k)^{\top}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Here we have used the matrices $e_k = \left[0_p,\dots,0_p,I_p,0_p,\dots,0_p\right)\big]^{\top} \in \mathbb{C}^{(n+1)p\times p}$ *with all its* $p\times p$ *blocks being the zero matrix* 0_p, *but for the* k*-th block which is the identity matrix* I_p.

Theorem 3 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas). *For $n < N$ and monic Geronimus perturbations, with masses as described in* (31)*, we have the following last quasideterminant expressions for the perturbed biorthogonal matrix polynomials*

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n & P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_n & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{47}$$

$$\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ (\chi(y))_{[n+1]}^\top \end{bmatrix}. \tag{48}$$

Proof. For $n < N$, (23) and (9) imply

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = P_n^{[1]}(x) + \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{n,0}, \dots, \omega_{n,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = I_p y^n + \begin{bmatrix} I_p, \dots, I_p y^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \left((\check{S}_2)^\top\right)_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ \left((\check{S}_2)^\top\right)_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, Lemma 7 gives the stated result. □

Remark 25 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas). *For masses as described in* (32)*, we have*

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{P_0^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_n & P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_n & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{J}_{C_0^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{P_0^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{J}_{C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{P_{n-1}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{n+1} \\ (\chi(y))_{[n+1]}^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.5. **Nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas.** We now present an alternative *orthogonality relations* approach for the derivation of Christoffel type formulas, that avoids the use of the second kind functions and of the spectral structure of the perturbing polynomial. A key feature of these results is that they hold even for perturbing matrix polynomials with singular leading coefficient.

Definition 34. *For a given perturbed matrix of generalized kernels $\check{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y}\left(W(y)\right)^{-1} + v_{x,y}$, with $v_{x,y}W(y) = 0_p$, we define a semi-infinite block matrix*

$$\begin{aligned} R &:= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} + \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 26. *Its blocks are* $R_{n,l} = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), I_p y^l \right\rangle_{\check{u}} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$. *Observe that for a Geronimus perturbation of a Borel measure* $d\mu(x,y)$, *with general masses as in* (31) *we have*

$$R_{n,l} = \int P_n^{[1]}(x)\, d\mu(x,y)(W(y))^{-1} y^l + \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_a}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{m!}\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\xi_{i,m}^{[a]}\right)_x\rangle \left(l_j^{(a)}(y) y^l\right)_{x_a}^{(m)},$$

that, when the masses are discrete and supported by the diagonal $y = x$, *reduces to*

$$R_{n,l} = \int P_n^{[1]}(x)\, d\mu(x,y)(W(y))^{-1} y^l + \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_a}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{m!}\left(P_n^{[1]}(x) x^l \xi_{i,m}^{[a]} l_j^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_a}^{(m)}.$$

Proposition 36. *The following relations hold true*

$$R = S_1 \check{G}, \tag{49}$$

$$\omega R = \check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}, \tag{50}$$

$$R W(\Lambda^\top) = H\left(S_2\right)^{-\top}. \tag{51}$$

Proof. (49) follows from Definition 34. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= S_1 \left\langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\right\rangle_{\check{u}}. \end{aligned}$$

To deduce (50) we recall (18), (49), and the Gauss factorization of the perturbed matrix of moments

$$\begin{aligned} \omega R &= \left(\check{S}_1 (S_1)^{-1}\right)(S_1 \check{G}) \\ &= \check{S}_1 \check{G} \\ &= \check{S}_1 \left((\check{S}_1)^{-1} \check{H} (\check{S}_2)^{-\top}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to get (51), we use (19) together with (50), which implies $\omega = \omega R W(\Lambda^\top)\left(S_2\right)^\top H^{-1}$, and as the resolvent is unitriangular with a unique inverse matrix [32], we obtain the result. □

From (50) it immediately follows that

Proposition 37. *The matrix* R *fulfills*

$$(\omega R)_{n,l} = \begin{cases} 0_p, & l \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}, \\ \check{H}_n, & n = l. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 38. *The matrix* $\begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \dots & R_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix}$ *is nonsingular.*

Proof. From (49) we conclude for the corresponding truncations that $R_{[n]} = (S_1)_{[n]} \check{G}_{[n]}$ is nonsingular, as we are assuming, to ensure the orthogonality, that $\check{G}_{[n]}$ is nonsingular for all $n \in \{1,2,\dots\}$. □

Definition 35. *Let us introduce the polynomials* $r_{n,l}^K(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[z]$, $l \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}$, *given by*

$$\begin{aligned} r_{n,l}^K(z) :&= \left\langle W(z) K_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l\right\rangle_{\check{u}} - I_p z^l \\ &= \left\langle W(z) K_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l\right\rangle_{uW^{-1}} + \left\langle W(z) K_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l\right\rangle_{v} - I_p z^l. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 39. *For* $l \in \{0,1,\dots,n-1\}$ *and* $m = \min(n, N)$ *we have*

$$r_{n,l}^K(z) = \left[(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(z))^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-1}, \dots, (\check{P}_{n-1+N}^{[2]}(z))^\top (\check{H}_{n-1+N})^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-m,l} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,l} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from (29), Definition 34, and (16). □

Definition 36. *For $n \geqslant N$, given the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times np},$$

we construct a submatrix of it by selecting Np columns among all the np columns. For that aim, we use indexes (i,a) labeling the columns, where i runs through $\{0,\dots,n-1\}$ and indicates the block, and $a \in \{1,\dots,p\}$ denotes the corresponding column in that block; i.e., (i,a) is an index selecting the a-th column of the i-block. Given a set of N different couples $I = \{(i_r,a_r)\}_{r=1}^{N}$, with a lexicographic ordering, we define the corresponding square *submatrix $R_n^{\square} := \left[c_{(i_1,a_1)},\dots,c_{(i_{Np},a_{Np})}\right]$. Here $c_{(i_r,a_r)}$ denotes the a_r-th column of the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,i_r} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,i_r} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The set of indexes I is said poised if $R_n^{\square}$ is nonsingular. We also use the notation where $r_n^{\square} := \left[\tilde{c}_{(i_1,a_1)},\dots,\tilde{c}_{(i_{Np},a_{Np})}\right]$. Here $\tilde{c}_{(i_r,a_r)}$ denotes the a_r-th column of the matrix R_{n,i_r}. Given a poised set of indexes we define $(r_n^K(y))^{\square}$ as the matrix built up by taking from the matrices $r_{n,i_r}^K(y)$ the columns a_r.

Lemma 8. *For $n \geqslant N$, there exists at least a poised set.*

Proof. For $n \geqslant N$, we consider the rectangular block matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times np}.$$

As the truncation $R_{[n]}$ is nonsingular, this matrix is full rank, i.e., all its Np rows are linearly independent. Thus, there must be Np independent columns and the desired result follows. □

Lemma 9. *Whenever the leading coefficient A_N of the perturbing polynomial $W(y)$ is nonsingular, we can decompose any monomial $I_p y^l$ as*

$$I_p y^l = \alpha_l(y)(W(y))^{\top} + \beta_l(y),$$

where $\alpha_l(y), \beta_l(y) = \beta_{l,0} + \cdots + \beta_{l,N-1}y^{N-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[y]$, with $\deg \alpha_l(y) \leqslant l - N$.

Proposition 40. *Let us assume that the matrix polynomial $W(y) = A_N y^N + \cdots + A_0$ has a nonsingular leading coefficient and $n \geqslant N$. Then, the set $\{0,1,\dots,N-1\}$ is poised.*

Proof. From Proposition 37 we deduce

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,l} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,l} \end{bmatrix} = -R_{n,l},$$

for $l \in \{0,1,\dots,n-1\}$. In particular, the resolvent vector $\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]$ is a solution of the linear system

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N,N-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n-1,N-1} \end{bmatrix} = -\left[R_{n,0},\dots,R_{n,N-1}\right]. \tag{52}$$

We will show now that this is the unique solution to this linear system. Let us proceed by contradiction and assume that there is another solution, say $\left[\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N},\dots,\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}\right]$. Consider then the monic matrix polynomial

$$\tilde{P}_n(x) = P_n^{[1]}(x) + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N}P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x).$$

Because $\left[\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N},\dots,\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}\right]$ solves (52) we know that

$$\langle \tilde{P}_n(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\breve{u}} = 0_p, \qquad l \in \{0,\dots,N-1\}.$$

Lemma 9 implies the following relations for $\deg \alpha_l(y) < m$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle P_m^{[1]}(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\check{u}} &= \langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \alpha_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}W} + \langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \alpha_l(y)\rangle_u + \langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

But $\deg \alpha_l(y) \leqslant l-N$, so that the previous equation will hold at least for $l-N < m$; i.e., $l < m+N$. Consequently, for $l \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \tilde{P}_n(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\check{u}} &= \langle P_n^{[1]}(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\check{u}} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\check{u}} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N}\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(y), I_p y^l\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}\langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N}\langle P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left(R_{n,k} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}R_{n-1,k} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N}R_{n-N,k}\right)(\beta_{l,k})^\top \\ &= 0_p.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from the uniqueness of the biorthogonal families, we deduce $\tilde{P}_n(x) = \check{P}_n^{[1]}(x)$, and, recalling (23), there is a unique solution of (52). Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \dots & R_{n-N,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \dots & R_{n-1,n-1}\end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular, and $I = \{0,\dots,N-1\}$ is a poised set. □

Proposition 41. *For $n < N$, we can write*

$$\left[\omega_{n,0},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] = -\left[R_{n,0},\dots,R_{n,n-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \dots & R_{n-1,n-1}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

For $n \geqslant N$, given poised set, which always exists, we have

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right] = -r_n^{\square}(R_n^{\square})^{-1}.$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 37. □

Theorem 4 (Non-spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas)**.** *Given a matrix Geronimus transformation the corresponding perturbed polynomials, $\{\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, and matrix norms $\{\check{H}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ can be expressed as follows. For $n \geqslant N$,*

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & P_{n-N}^{[1]}(x) \\ R_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \\ \hline r_n^{\square} & P_n^{[1]}(x)\end{array}\right], \qquad \left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top A_N = -\Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & H_{n-N} \\ & 0_p \\ R_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & 0_p \\ \hline (r_n^K(y))^{\square} & 0_p\end{array}\right],$$

and two alternative expressions

$$\check{H}_n = \Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & R_{n-N,n} \\ R_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & R_{n-1,n} \\ \hline r_n^{\square} & R_{n,n}\end{array}\right] = \Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & H_{n-N} \\ & 0_p \\ R_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & 0_p \\ \hline r_n^{\square} & 0_p\end{array}\right]$$

For $n < N$, *we have* $\check{H}_n = \Theta_*\big(R_{[n+1]}\big)$ *and*

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} & P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ R_{n,0} & \dots & R_{n,n-1} & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} & R_{0,n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \dots & R_{n-1,n-1} & R_{n-1,n} \\ I_p & \dots & I_p y^{n-1} & I_p y^n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. For $m = \min(n, N)$, from the connection formula (20) we have

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = [\omega_{n,n-m}, \dots, \omega_{n,n-1}] \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-m}^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix} + P_n^{[1]}(x),$$

and from Proposition 37 we deduce

$$\check{H}_n = [\omega_{n,n-m}, \dots, \omega_{n,n-1}] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-m,n} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix} + R_{n,n},$$

and use (43). Then, recalling Proposition 41 we obtain the desired formulas for $\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x)$ and $\check{H}_n$. For $n \geqslant N$, we have

$$r_{n,l}^K(y) = \left[(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-1}, \dots, (\check{P}_{n-1+N}^{[2]}(y))^\top (\check{H}_{n-1+N})^{-1}\right] \Omega[n] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,l} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,l} \end{bmatrix},$$

so that

$$(r_n^K(y))^\square (R_n^\square)^{-1} = \left[(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-1}, \dots, (\check{P}_{n-1+N}^{[2]}(y))^\top (\check{H}_{n-1+N})^{-1}\right] \Omega[n].$$

In particular, recalling (22), we deduce that

$$(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top A_N = (r_n^K(y))^\square (R_n^\square)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} H_{n-N} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $n < N$, we can write (50) as $R\big(\check{S}_2\big)^\top = \omega^{-1}\check{H}$, which implies

$$\begin{bmatrix} \big((S_2)^\top\big)_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ \big((S_2)^\top\big)_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix} = -\big(R_{[n]}\big)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix},$$

giving in turn

$$\begin{aligned} \big(P_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top &= y^n + \big[I_p, \dots, I_p y^{n-1}\big] \begin{bmatrix} \big((S_2)^\top\big)_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ \big((S_2)^\top\big)_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= y^n - \big[I_p, \dots, I_p y^{n-1}\big] \big(R_{[n]}\big)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that the Gauss–Borel factorization $R_{[n]} = \big(\omega_{[n]}\big)^{-1}\check{H}_{[n]}\big((\check{S}_2)_{[n]}\big)^{-\top}$, gives the formulas in the previous theorem, for $n < N$.

2.6. **Spectral versus nonspectral.**

Definition 37. *We introduce the truncation given by taking only the first* N *columns of a given semi-infinite matrix*

$$R^{(N)} := \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & R_{0,1} & \dots & R_{0,N-1} \\ R_{1,0} & R_{0,1} & \dots & R_{1,N-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we can connect the spectral methods and the nonspectral techniques as follows

Proposition 42. *The following relation takes place*

$$\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} = -R^{(N)} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}.$$

Proof. From (26) we deduce that

$$\check{C}^{[1]}(x) W(x) - \check{H}\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}(\chi(x))_{[N]} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \omega C^{[1]}(x).$$

Taking the corresponding root spectral jets, we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}_{\check{C}^{[1]} W} - \check{H}\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \omega \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}},$$

that, together with (41), gives

$$\omega\Big(\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\Big) = -\check{H}\big(\check{S}_2\big)^{-\top} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, relation (50) implies

$$\omega\Big(\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} + R^{(N)} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}\Big) = 0.$$

But, given that ω is a lower unitriangular matrix, and therefore with an inverse, see [32], the unique solution to $\omega X = 0$, where X is a semi-infinite matrix, is $X = 0$. □

We now discuss an important fact, which ensures that the spectral Christoffel–Geronimus formulas presented in previous sections make sense

Corollary 1. *If the leading coefficient* A_N *is nonsingular and* $n \geqslant N$*, then*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular.

Proof. From Proposition 42 one deduces the following formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \dots & R_{n-N,N-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n-1,0} & \dots & R_{n-1,N-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}. \tag{53}$$

Now, Proposition 40 and Lemma 2 lead to the result. □

We stress at this point that (53) connects the spectral and the nonspectral methods. Moreover, when we border with a further block row we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-N}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N,0} & \dots & R_{n-N,N-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n,0} & \dots & R_{n,N-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}.$$

Corollary 2. *If the leading coefficient A_N is nonsingular and $n < N$, then*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{0}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{0}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}_n$$

is nonsingular, and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{0}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{0}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix}$$

is full rank.

Proof. From Proposition 42 we know that when the leading coefficient A_N is nonsingular the following relation holds

$$\left(\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}\right)\mathcal{R} = -R^{(N)},$$

where $\mathcal{R} = (Y, JY, \dots, J^{N-1}Y)$ is a Jordan triple (X, Y, J) of the perturbing polynomial $W(x)$. Thus, for $n < N$ we have in terms of the truncation $\mathcal{R}_n = (Y, JY, \dots, J^{n-1}Y)$, which as we have proved is a full rank matrix,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{0}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{0}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}_n = - \begin{bmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n,0} & \dots & R_{n,n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, as $\begin{vmatrix} R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n,0} & \dots & R_{n,n-1} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$, we deduce the result. □

2.7. **Applications.**

2.7.1. *Unimodular Christoffel perturbations and nonspectral techniques.* The spectral methods apply to those Geronimus transformations with a perturbing polynomial $W(y)$ having a nonsingular leading coefficient A_N. This was also the case for the techniques developed in [12] for matrix Christoffel transformations, where the perturbing polynomial had a nonsingular leading coefficient. However, we have shown that despite we can extend the use of the spectral techniques to the study of matrix Geronimus transformations, we also have a nonspectral approach applicable even for singular leading coefficients. For example, some cases that have appeared several times in the literature –see [48]– are unimodular perturbations and, consequently, with $W(y)$ having a singular leading coefficient. In this case, we have that $(W(y))^{-1}$ is a matrix polynomial, and we can consider the Geronimus transformation associated with the matrix polynomial $(W(y))^{-1}$ –as the spectrum is empty $\sigma(W(y)) = \varnothing$, no masses appear– as a Christoffel transformation with perturbing matrix polynomial $W(y)$ of the original matrix of generalized kernels

$$\check{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y}\left((W(y))^{-1}\right)^{-1} = u_{x,y}W(y). \tag{54}$$

We can apply Theorem 4 with

$$R = \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{uW}, \qquad R_{n,l} = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), I_p y^l \right\rangle_{uW} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}.$$

For example, when the matrix of generalized kernels is a matrix of measures μ, we can write

$$R_{n,l} = \int P_n^{[1]}(x)\, d\,\mu(x,y) W(y) y^l.$$

Here $W(x)$ is a Christoffel perturbation and $\deg((W(x))^{-1})$ gives you the number of original orthogonal polynomials required for the Christoffel type formula. Theorem 4 can be nicely applied to get $\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x)$ and $\check{H}_n$. However, it only gives Christoffel–Geronimus formulas for $\left(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top A_N$ and given that A_N is singular, we only partially recover $\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)$. This problem disappears whenever we have symmetric generalized kernels $u_{x,y} = (u_{y,x})^\top$, see Remark 13, as then $P_n^{[1]}(x) = P_n^{[2]}(x) =: P_n(x)$ and biorthogonality collapses to orthogonality of $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$. From (54), we need to require

$$u_{x,y} W(y) = (W(x))^\top (u_{y,x})^\top,$$

that when the initial matrix of kernels is itself symmetric $u_{x,y} = (u_{y,x})^\top$ reads $u_{x,y}W(y) = (W(x))^\top u_{x,y}$. Now, if we are dealing with Hankel matrices of generalized kernels $u_{x,y} = u_{x,x}$ we find $u_{x,x,}W(x) = (W(x))^\top u_{x,x}$, that for the scalar case reads $u_{x,x} = u_0 I_p$ with u_0 a generalized function we need $W(x)$ to be a symmetric matrix polynomial. For this scenario, if $\{p_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ denotes the set of monic orthogonal polynomials associated with u_0, we have $R_{n,l} = \langle u_0, p_n(x) W(x) x^l \rangle$.

For example, if we take $p = 2$, with the unimodular perturbation given by

$$W(x) = \begin{bmatrix} (A_2)_{1,1}x^2 + (A_1)_{1,1}x + (A_0)_{1,1} & (A_2)_{1,2}x^2 + (A_1)_{1,2}x + (A_0)_{1,2} \\ (A_2)_{1,2}x^2 + (A_1)_{1,2}x + (A_0)_{1,2} & (A_2)_{2,2}x^2 + (A_1)_{2,2}x + (A_0)_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}$$

we have, that the inverse is the following matrix polynomial

$$(W(x))^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det W(x)} \begin{bmatrix} (A_2)_{2,2}x^2 + (A_1)_{2,2}x + (A_0)_{2,2} & -(A_2)_{1,2}x^2 - (A_1)_{1,2}x - (A_0)_{1,2} \\ -(A_2)_{1,2}x^2 - (A_1)_{1,2}x - (A_0)_{1,2} & (A_2)_{1,1}x^2 + (A_1)_{1,1}x + (A_0)_{1,1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\det W(x)$ is a constant, and the inverse has also degree 2. Therefore, for $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, we have the following expressions for the perturbed matrix orthogonal polynomials

$$\check{P}_n(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & p_{n-2}(x) I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & p_{n-1}(x) I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_n(x) x^k A_2 x^2\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x)\rangle & p_n(x) I_p \end{bmatrix},$$

and the corresponding matrix norms or quasitau matrices are

$$\check{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^n (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^n (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_n(x) x^k A_2 x^2\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x) x^n (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here the natural numbers k and l satisfy $0 \leqslant k < l \leqslant n-1$ and are among those (we know that they do exist) that fulfil

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^k (A_2x^2 + A_1x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x) x^l (A_2x^2 + A_1x + A_0)\rangle \end{bmatrix} \neq 0.$$

Observe that the case of size $p = 2$ unimodular matrix polynomials is particularly simple, because the degree of the perturbation and its inverse coincide. However, for bigger sizes this is not the case. For a better understanding, let us recall that unimodular matrices always factorize in terms of elementary matrix polynomials and elementary matrices, which are of the following form

i) Elementary matrix polynomials: $e_{i,j}(x) = I_p + E_{i,j}p(x)$ with $i \neq j$ and $E_{i,j}$ the matrix with a 1 at the (i,j) entry and zero elsewhere, and $p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$.
ii) Elementary matrices:
   (a) $I_p + (c-1)E_{i,i}$ with $c \in \mathbb{C}$.
   (b) $\eta^{(i,j)} = I_p - E_{i,i} - E_{j,j} + E_{i,j} + E_{j,i}$: the identity matrix with the i-th and j-th rows interchanged.

The inverses of these matrices are elementary again

$$(e_{i,j}(x))^{-1} = I_p - p(x)E_{i,j},$$
$$(I_p + (c-1)E_{i,i})^{-1} = I_p + (c^{-1}-1)E_{i,i},$$
$$(\eta^{(i,j)})^{-1} = \eta^{(i,j)},$$

and the inverse of a general unimodular matrix polynomial can be computed immediately once its factorization in terms of elementary matrices is given. However, the degree of the matrix polynomial and its inverse requires a separate analysis.

If our perturbation $W(x) = I_p + p(x)E_{i,j}$ is an elementary matrix polynomial, with $\deg p(x) = N$, then we have that $(W(x))^{-1} = I_p - p(x)E_{i,j}$ and $\deg W(x) = \deg((W(x))^{-1}) = N$. If we assume a departing matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y}$, for $n \geqslant N$, the first family of perturbed polynomials will be

$$\check{P}^{[1]}_n(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), y^{k_1}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & \dots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), y^{k_N}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x), y^{k_1}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & \dots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n}(x), y^{k_N}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & P^{[1]}_{n}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, the sequence of different integers $\{k_1, \dots, k_N\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), y^{k_1}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & \dots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N}(x), y^{k_N}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), y^{k_1}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u & \dots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), y^{k_N}(I_p + p(y)E_{i,j})\right\rangle_u \end{bmatrix} \neq 0.$$

A bit more complex situation appears when we have the product of different elementary matrix polynomials, for example

$$W(x) = \left(I_p + p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)E_{i_1,j_1}\right)\left(I_p + p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}(x)E_{i_2,j_2}\right),$$

which has two possible forms depending on whether $j_1 \neq i_2$ or $j_1 = i_2$

$$W(x) = \begin{cases} I_p + p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)E_{i_1,j_1} + p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}(x)E_{i_2,j_2}, & j_1 \neq i_2, \\ I_p + p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)E_{i_1,j_1} + p^{(2)}_{j_2,j_2}(x)E_{j_2,j_2} + p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)p^{(2)}_{j_1,j_2}(x)E_{i_1,j_2}, & j_1 = i_2, \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\deg(W(x)) = \begin{cases} (1-\delta_{i_1,i_2}\delta_{j_1,j_2})\max\left(\deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)), \deg(p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}(x))\right) + \delta_{i_1,i_2}\delta_{j_1,j_2}\deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x) + p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}), & j_1 \neq i_2, \\ \deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)) + \deg(p^{(1)}_{j_1,j_2}(x)), & j_1 = i_2. \end{cases}$$

For the inverse, we find

$$(W(x))^{-1} = \begin{cases} I_p - p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)E_{i_1,j_1} - p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}(x)E_{i_2,j_2}, & j_2 \neq i_1, \\ I_p - p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)E_{i_1,j_1} - p^{(2)}_{i_2,i_1}(x)E_{i_2,i_1} + p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)p^{(2)}_{i_2,i_1}(x)E_{i_2,j_1}, & j_2 = i_1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\deg\left((W(x))^{-1}\right) = \begin{cases} (1-\delta_{i_1,i_2}\delta_{j_1,j_2})\max(\deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)), \deg(p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}(x)) + \delta_{i_1,i_2}\delta_{j_1,j_2}\deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x) + p^{(2)}_{i_2,j_2}), & j_2 \neq i_1, \\ \deg(p^{(1)}_{i_1,j_1}(x)) + \deg(p^{(2)}_{i_2,i_1}(x)), & j_2 = i_1. \end{cases}$$

Thus, if either $j_1 \neq i_2$ and $j_2 \neq i_1$, or when $j_1 = i_2$ and $j_2 = i_1$, the degrees $W(x)$ and $(W(x))^{-1}$ coincide, for $j_1 = i_2$ and $j_2 \neq i_1$ we find $\deg W(x) > \deg((W(x))^{-1})$ and when $j_1 \neq i_2$ and $j_2 = i_1$ we have $\deg W(x) < \deg((W(x))^{-1})$. Consequently, the degrees of unimodular matrix polynomials can be bigger than, equal to or smaller than the degrees of its inverses.

We will be interested in unimodular perturbations $W(x)$ that factorize in terms of K elementary polynomial factors $\{e_{i_m,j_m}(x)\}_{m=1}^K$ and L exchange factors $\{\eta^{(l_n,q_n)}\}_{n=1}^L$. We will use the following notation for elementary polynomials and elementary matrices

$$(i,j)_{p_{i,j}(x)} := E_{i,j}p_{i,j}(x) \qquad\qquad [l,q] := \eta_{l,q},$$

suited to take products among them, according to the product table

$$\begin{aligned}(i_1,j_1)_{p_{i_1,j_1}}(i_2,j_2)_{p_{i_2,j_2}} &= \delta_{j_1,i_2}(i_1,j_2)_{p_{i_1,j_1}p_{i_2,j_2}},\\ [l,q](i,j)_{p_{i,j}} &= (1-\delta_{l,i})(1-\delta_{q,i})(i,j)_{p_{i,j}}+\delta_{l,i}(q,j)_{p_{i,j}}+\delta_{q,i}(l,j)_{p_{i,j}},\\ (i,j)_{p_{i,j}}[l,q] &= (1-\delta_{l,j})(1-\delta_{q,j})(i,j)_{p_{i,j}}+\delta_{l,j}j(i,)_{p_{i,j}}+\delta_{q,j}(i,l)_{p_{i,j}}.\end{aligned}$$

Bearing this in mind, we denote all the possible permutations of a vector with K entries, having i out of these equal to 1 and the rest equal to zero, by $\sigma_i^K=\{\sigma_{i,j}^K\}_{j=1}^{|\sigma_i^K|}$ with $\sigma_{i,j}^K=\left((\sigma_{i,j}^K)_1,\dots,(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_K\right)\in(\mathbb{Z}_2)^K$ where $(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_r\in\mathbb{Z}_2:=\{1,0\}$ and $|\sigma_i^K|=\binom{K}{i}$ we can rewrite a given unimodular perturbation as a sum. Actually, any unimodular polynomial that factorizes in terms of K elementary polynomials $e_{i,j}(x)$ and L elementary matrices $\eta^{(l,q)}$, in a given order, can be expanded into a sum of 2^K terms

$$\begin{aligned}W(x) &= e_{i_1,j_1}(x)\cdots e_{i_r,j_r}(x)\eta^{(l_1,q_1)}\cdots\eta^{(l_t,q_t)}e_{i_{r+1},j_{r+1}}(x)\cdots\eta^{(l_L,q_L)}\cdots e_{i_K,j_K}(x)\\ &=\sum_{i=0}^{K}\sum_{j=1}^{|\sigma_i^K|}(i_1,j_1)_{p_{i_1,j_1}}^{(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_1}\cdots(i_r,j_r)_{p_{i_r,j_r}}^{(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_r}[l_1,q_1]\cdots[l_t,q_t](i_{r+1},j_{r+1})_{p_{i_{r+1},j_{r+1}}}^{(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_{r+1}}\dots[l_L,q_L]\dots(i_K,j_K)_{p_{i_K,j_K}}^{(\sigma_{i,j}^K)_K},\end{aligned}$$

where $(i,j)_{p_{i,j}}^0=\mathbb{I}_p$. Notice that although in the factorization of W we have assumed that it starts and ends with elementary polynomials, the result would still be valid if it started and/or ended with an interchange elementary matrix η. We notationally simplify these type of expressions by considering the sequences of couples of natural numbers $\{i_1,j_1\}\{(i_2,j_2\}),\dots,\{i_k,j_k\}\}$, where $\{n,m\}$ stands either for $(n,m)_{p_{m,n}}$ or $[m,n]$, and identifying paths. We say that two couples of naturals $\{k,l\}$ and $\{n,m\}$ are linked if $l=n$. When we deal with a couple $[n,m]$ the order is not of the natural numbers is not relevant, for example (k,l) and $[l,m]$ are linked as well as (k,l) and $[m,l]$ are linked. A path of length l is a subset of I of the form

$$\left\{\{a_1,a_2\},\{a_2,a_3\},\{a_3,a_4\},\dots,\{a_{l-1},a_l\},\{a_l,a_{l+1}\}\right\}_l.$$

The order of the sequence is respected for the construction of each path. Thus, the element (a_i,a_{i+1}), as an element of the sequence I, is previous to the element (a_{i+1},a_{i+2}) in the sequence. A path is proper if it does not belong to a longer path. Out of the 2^K terms that appear only paths remain. In order to know the degree of the unimodular polynomial one must check the factors of the proper paths, and look for the maximum degree involved in those factors . For a better understanding let us work out a couple of significant examples. These examples deal with non symmetric matrices and, therefore, we have complete Christoffel type expressions for $\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x)$ and $\check{H}_n$, but also the mentioned penalty for $P_n^{[2]}(x)$. Firstly, let us consider a polynomial with $K=5$, $L=0$ and $p=6$,

$$W(x)=e_{1,2}(x)e_{2,3}(x)e_{3,6}(x)e_{4,3}(x)e_{3,5}(x)$$

in terms of sequences of couples the paths for this unimodular polynomial has the following structure

$$\begin{gathered}\{\varnothing\}_{i=5},\\ \{\varnothing\}_{i=4},\\ \underline{\{(1,2),(2,3),(3,6)\}_{i=3}},\underline{\{(1,2),(2,3),(3,5)\}_{i=3}},\\ \underline{\{(4,3),(3,5)\}_{i=2}},\{(2,3),(3,5)\}_{i=2},\{(2,3),(3,6)\}_{i=2},\{(1,2)(2,3)\}_{i=2},\\ \{(1,2)\}_{i=1},\{(2,3)\}_{i=1},\{(3,6)\}_{i=1},\{(4,3)\}_{i=1},\{(3,5)\}_{i=1},\\ \{I_6\}_{i=0},\end{gathered}$$

where $\{I_6\}_{i=0}$ indicates that the product not involving couples produces the identity matrix (in general will be a product of interchanging matrices) and we have underlined the proper paths. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) &= e_{1,2}(x)e_{2,3}(x)e_{3,6}(x)e_{4,3}(x)e_{3,5}(x) \\ &= (1,6)_{p_{1,2}p_{2,3}p_{3,6}} + (1,5)_{p_{1,2}p_{2,3}p_{3,5}} + (4,5)_{p_{4,3}p_{3,5}} + (2,5)_{p_{2,3}p_{3,5}} + (2,6)_{p_{2,3}p_{3,6}} + (1,3)_{p_{1,2}p_{2,3}} \\ &+ (1,2)_{p_{1,2}} + (2,3)_{p_{2,3}} + (3,6)_{p_{3,6}} + (4,3)_{p_{4,3}} + (3,5)_{p_{3,5}} + I_5 \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & p_{1,2}(x) & p_{1,2}(x)p_{2,3}(x) & 0 & p_{1,2}(x)p_{2,3}(x)p_{3,5}(x) & p_{1,2}(x)p_{2,3}(x)p_{3,6}(x) \\ 0 & 1 & p_{2,3}(x) & 0 & p_{2,3}(x)p_{3,5}(x) & p_{2,3}(x)p_{3,6}(x) \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & p_{3,5}(x) & p_{3,6}(x) \\ 0 & 0 & p_{4,3}(x) & 1 & p_{4,3}(x)p_{3,5}(x) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Its inverse is

$$(W(x))^{-1} = (e_{3,5}(x))^{-1}(e_{4,3}(x))^{-1}(e_{3,6}(x))^{-1}(x)(e_{2,3}(x))^{-1}(e_{1,2}(x))^{-1},$$

and the paths are

$$\begin{gathered} \{\varnothing\}_{i=5}, \\ \{\varnothing\}_{i=4}, \\ \{\varnothing\}_{i=3}, \\ \underline{\{(4,3),(3,6)\}_{i=2}}, \\ \underline{\{(3,5)\}_{i=1}}, \{(4,3)\}_{i=1}, \{(3,6)\}_{i=1}, \underline{\{(2,3)\}_{i=1}}, \underline{\{(1,2)\}_{i=1}}, \\ \{I_6\}_{i=0}. \end{gathered}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (W(x))^{-1} &= (4,6)_{p_{4,3}p_{3,6}} + (3,5)_{-p_{3,5}} + (4,3)_{-p_{4,3}} + (3,6)_{-p_{3,6}} + (2,3)_{-p_{2,3}} + (1,2)_{-p_{1,2}} + I_6 \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -p_{1,2}(x) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -p_{2,3}(x) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -p_{3,5}(x) & -p_{3,6}(x) \\ 0 & 0 & -p_{4,3}(x) & 1 & 0 & p_{4,3}(x)p_{3,6}(x) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, looking at the proper paths, we find

$$\deg W(x) = \max\big(\deg p_{1,2}(x) + \deg p_{2,3}(x) + \deg p_{3,6}(x), \deg p_{1,2}(x) + \deg p_{2,3}(x) + \deg p_{3,5}(x), \deg p_{4,3}(x) + \deg p_{3,5}(x)\big),$$
$$\deg((W(x))^{-1}) = \max\big(\deg p_{1,2}(x), \deg p_{2,3}(x), \deg p_{3,6}(x) + \deg p_{4,3}(x), \deg p_{3,5}(x)\big).$$

For example, if we assume that

$$\deg p_{1,2}(x) = 2, \qquad \deg p_{2,3}(x) = 1, \qquad \deg p_{3,6}(x) = 2, \qquad \deg p_{4,3}(x) = 1, \qquad \deg p_{3,5}(x) = 3,$$

we get for the corresponding unimodular matrix polynomial and its inverse

$$\deg(W(x)) = 6, \qquad \deg\big((W(x))^{-1}\big) = 3,$$

so that, for example, the first family of perturbed biorthogonal polynomials, for $n \geqslant 3$ is

$$\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \langle P_{n-3}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_1}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-3}^{[1]}(x), x^{k_2}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-3}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_3}W(y)\rangle_u & P_{n-3}^{[1]}(x) \\ \langle P_{n-2}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_1}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-2}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_2}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-2}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_3}W(y)\rangle_u & P_{n-2}^{[1]}(x) \\ \langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_1}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_2}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), y^{k_3}W(y)\rangle_u & P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \\ \langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^{k_1}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^{k_2}W(y)\rangle_u & \langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^{k_3}W(y)\rangle_u & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{55}$$

Here, the sequence of different integers $\{k_1, k_2, k_3\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-3}(x), y^{k_1} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-3}(x), y^{k_2} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-3}(x), y^{k_3} W(y) \right\rangle_u \\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-2}(x), y^{k_1} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-2}(x), y^{k_2} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-2}(x), y^{k_3} W(y) \right\rangle_u \\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), y^{k_1} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), y^{k_2} W(y) \right\rangle_u & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-1}(x), y^{k_3} W(y) \right\rangle_u \end{bmatrix} \neq 0.$$

Let us now work out a polynomial with $K = L = 4$ and $p = 5$. The unimodular matrix polynomial we consider is

$$W(x) = e_{2,1}(x)\eta^{(1,4)}\eta^{(5,4)}e_{5,1}(x)\eta^{(3,2)}e_{2,3}(x)\eta^{(3,1)}e_{1,5}(x).$$

The paths are

$$\{\varnothing\}_{i=4},$$
$$\{\varnothing\}_{i=3},$$
$$\underline{\{(2,1),[1,4],[5,4],(5,1),[3,2],[3,1]\}_{i=2}}, \underline{\{[1,4],[5,4],[3,2],(2,3),[3,1],(1,5)\}_{i=2}},$$
$$\{(2,1),[1,4],[5,4],[3,2],[3,1]\}_{i=1}, \{[1,4],[5,4],(5,1),[3,2],[3,1]\}_{i=1}, \{[1,4],[5,4],[3,2],(2,3),[3,1]\}_{i=1}, \{[1,4],[5,4],[3,2],[3,1],(1,5)\}_{i=1},$$
$$\{[1,4],[5,4],[3,2],[3,1]\}_{i=0},$$

so that

$$W(x) = (2,3)_{p_{2,1}p_{5,1}} + (3,5)_{p_{2,3}p_{1,5}} + (2,5)_{p_{2,1}} + (1,3)_{p_{5,1}} + (3,1)_{p_{2,3}} + (2,5)_{p_{1,5}} + [1,4][5,4][3,2][3,1] \tag{56}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & p_{5,1}(x) & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & p_{2,1}(x)p_{5,1}(x) & 0 & p_{2,1}(x) + p_{1,5}(x) \\ p_{2,3}(x) & 1 & 0 & 0 & p_{2,3}(x)p_{1,5}(x) \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{57}$$

The inverse matrix is

$$(W(x))^{-1} = (e_{1,5}(x))^{-1}\eta^{(3,1)}(e_{2,3}(x))^{-1}\eta^{(3,2)}(e_{5,1}(x))^{-1}\eta^{(5,4)}\eta^{(1,4)}(e_{2,1}(x))^{-1},$$

with paths given by

$$\{\varnothing\}_{i=4},$$
$$\{\varnothing\}_{i=3},$$
$$\underline{\{(1,5),[3,1],[3,2],(5,1),[5,4],[1,4]\}_{i=2}}, \underline{\{[3,1],(2,3),[3,2],[5,4],[1,4],(2,1)\}_{i=2}},$$
$$\{[3,1],[3,2],[5,4],[1,4],(2,1)\}_{i=1}, \{[3,1],[3,2],(5,1),[5,4],[1,4]\})_{i=1}, \{[3,1],(2,3),[3,2],[5,4],[1,4]\})_{i=1}, \{(1,5),[3,1],[3,2],[5,4],[1,4]\}_{i=1},$$
$$\{[3,1],[3,2],[5,4],[1,4]\}_{i=0},$$

and, consequently,

$$(W(x))^{-1} = (1,4)_{p_{1,5}p_{5,1}} + (2,1)_{p_{2,3}p_{2,1}} + (1,1)_{-p_{2,1}} + (5,4)_{-p_{5,1}} + (2,2)_{-p_{2,3}} + (1,1)_{-p_{1,5}} + [3,1][3,2][5,4][1,4]$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} -p_{2,1}(x) - p_{1,5}(x) & 1 & 0 & p_{1,5}(x)p_{5,1}(x) & 0 \\ p_{2,3}(x)p_{2,1}(x) & -p_{2,3}(x) & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -p_{5,1}(x) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proper paths, which we have underlined, give the degrees of the polynomials

$$\deg W(x) = \max\left(\deg p_{2,1}(x) + \deg p_{5,1}(x), \deg p_{1,5}(x) + \deg p_{2,3}(x)\right),$$
$$\deg((W(x))^{-1}) = \max\left(\deg p_{1,5}(x) + \deg p_{5,1}(x), \deg p_{2,3}(x) + \deg p_{2,1}(x)\right).$$

For example, if we assume that

$$\deg p_{2,1}(x) = 2, \qquad \deg p_{5,1}(x) = 1, \qquad \deg p_{1,5}(x) = 2, \qquad \deg p_{2,3}(x) = 1,$$

we find $\deg W(x) = \deg((W(x))^{-1}) = 3$ and formula (55) is applicable for $W(x)$ as given in (56).

If we seek for symmetric unimodular polynomials of the form

$$W(x) = V(x)\big(V(x)\big)^{\top},$$

where $V(x)$ is a unimodular matrix polynomial. For example, we put $p = 4$, and consider

$$V(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & p_{1,2}(x)p_{3,2}(x) & p_{1,2}(x) & 0 \\ 0 & p_{3,2}(x) & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p_{4,3}(x) & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

in such a way the perturbing symmetric unimodular matrix polynomial is

$$W(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1+(p_{1,2}(x))^2(p_{3,2}(x))^2 & p_{1,2}(x)(p_{3,2}(x))^2+p_{1,2}(x) & p_{1,2}(x)p_{3,2}(x) & p_{1,2}(x)p_{4,3}(x) \\ p_{1,2}(x)(p_{3,2}(x))^2+p_{1,2}(x) & 1+(p_{3,2}(x))^2 & p_{3,2}(x) & p_{4,3}(x) \\ p_{1,2}(x)p_{3,2}(x) & p_{3,2}(x) & 1 & 0 \\ p_{1,2}(x)p_{4,3}(x) & p_{4,3}(x) & 0 & 1+(p_{4,3}(x))^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us assume that

$$\deg p_{1,2}(x) = 3, \qquad \deg p_{3,2}(x) = 1, \qquad \deg p_{4,3}(x) = 1,$$

then

$$\deg W(x) = 8, \qquad \deg\big((W(x))^{-1}\big) = 4.$$

Now, we take a scalar matrix of linear functionals $u = u_0 I_p$, with $u_0 \in \big(\mathbb{R}[x]\big)'$ positive definite, and assume that the polynomials $p_{1,2}(x), p_{2,3}(x), p_{3,4}(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. Then, we obtain matrix orthogonal polynomials $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ for the matrix of linear functionals $W(x)u_0$, which in terms of the sequence of scalar orthogonal polynomials $\{p_n(x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of the linear functional u_0 are, for $n \geqslant 4$

$$P_n(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle & p_{n-4}(x)I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle & p_{n-3}(x)I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle & p_{n-2}(x)I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle & p_{n-1}(x)I_p \\ \langle u_0, p_n(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_n(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle & p_n(x)I_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

The set $\{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-4}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-3}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-2}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle \\ \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_1}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_2}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_3}W(x)\rangle & \langle u_0, p_{n-1}(x)x^{k_4}W(x)\rangle \end{bmatrix} \neq 0.$$

2.7.2. *Degree one matrix Geronimus transformations.* We consider a degree one perturbing polynomial of the form

$$W(x) = xI_p - A,$$

and assume, for the sake of simplicity, that all ξ are taken zero, i.e., there are no masses. Observe that in this case a Jordan pair (X, J) is such that $A = XJX^{-1}$, and Lemma 1 implies that the root spectral jet of a polynomial $P(x) = \sum_k P_k x^k \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$ is $\mathcal{J}_P = P(A)X$, where we understand a right evaluation, i.e., $P(A) := \sum_k P_k A^k$. An similar argument, for $\sigma(A) \cap \operatorname{supp}_y(u) = \varnothing$, yields

$$\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} = \Big\langle P^{[1]}(x), (A - I_p y)^{-1}X \Big\rangle_u,$$

expressed in terms of the resolvent $(A - I_p y)^{-1}$ of A. Formally, it can be written

$$\mathcal{J}_{C_n^{[1]}} = C_n^{[1]}(A)X,$$

where we again understand a right evaluation in the Taylor series of the Cauchy transform. Moreover, we also need the root spectral jet of the mixed Christoffel–Darboux kernel

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \big(P_k^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \big(H_k\big)^{-1} C_k^{[1]}(A)X \\ &=: K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(A,y)X,\end{aligned}$$

that for a Hankel generalized kernel $u_{x,y}$, using the Christoffel–Darboux formula for mixed kernels, reads

$$\mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) = \Big(\big(P_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \big(H_{n-1}\big)^{-1} C_n^{[1]}(A) - \big(P_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \big(H_{n-1}\big)^{-1} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A) + I_p\Big)(A - I_p y)^{-1}X.$$

We also have $\mathcal{V}(x,y) = I_p$ so that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{V}} = X$.

Thus, for $n \geqslant 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\check{P}_n^{[1]}(x) &= \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)X & P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \\ C_n^{[1]}(A)X & P_n^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix} \\ &= P_n^{[1]}(x) - C_n^{[1]}(A)\big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)\big)^{-1} P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), \\ \check{H}_n &= \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)X & H_{n-1} \\ C_n^{[1]}(A)X & 0_p\end{bmatrix} \\ &= -C_n^{[1]}(A)\big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)\big)^{-1} H_{n-1}, \\ \big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top &= \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)X & H_{n-1} \\ (I_p y - A)\big(K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(A,y) + I_p\big)X & 0_p\end{bmatrix} \\ &= \big((I_p y - A)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(A,y) + I_p\big)\big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)\big)^{-1} H_{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

For a Hankel matrix of bivariate generalized functionals, i.e., with a Hankel Gram matrix so that the Christoffel–Darboux formula holds, we have

$$\big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top = -(I_p y - A)\Big(\big(P_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \big(H_{n-1}\big)^{-1} C_n^{[1]}(A) - \big(P_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \big(H_{n-1}\big)^{-1} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A)\Big)(I_p y - A)^{-1} H_{n-1}.$$

3. Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformations

In 1969, Uvarov in §1 of [126] considered for the first time a massless Geronimus–Uvarov transformation for scalar orthogonal polynomials –called linear spectral transformations in [128]– finding (as Uvarov called them) general Christoffel formulas for these transformations. The results in §1 of [126] are a detailed version of the results presented in [125] in 1959 in Russian. See [128, 53] for more details. We now consider a transformation generated by two matrix polynomials $W_C(x), W_G(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]$, that we call Christoffel and Geronimus polynomials, respectively. This can be understood as a composition of a Geronimus transformation as treated in the previous section and a Christoffel transformation as discussed in [12].

Definition 38. *Given two matrix polynomials $W_C(x), W_G(y)$ of degrees N_C, N_G, and a matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y} \in (\mathcal{O}_c')^{p\times p}$ such that $\sigma(W_G(y))) \cap \operatorname{supp}_y(u) = \varnothing$, a matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation $\hat{u}_{x,y}$ of $u_{x,y}$ is a matrix of generalized kernels such that*

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} W_G(y) = W_C(x) u_{x,y}. \tag{58}$$

Proposition 43. *The perturbed Gram matrix $\hat{G} := \langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\rangle_{\hat{u}}$ and the original one G satisfy*

$$\hat{G} W_G(\Lambda^\top) = W_C(\Lambda) G.$$

The sequilinear forms are related by

$$\Big\langle P(x), Q(y)\big(W_G(y)\big)^\top \Big\rangle_{\hat{u}} = \langle P(x) W_C(x), Q(y)\rangle_u.$$

As we did for the Geronimus transformation, we assume that the perturbed moment matrix admits a Gauss–Borel factorization $\hat{G} = \hat{S}_1^{-1}\hat{H}(\hat{S}_2)^{-\top}$, where $\hat{S}_1, \hat{S}_2$ are lower unitriangular block matrices and $\hat{H}$ is a diagonal block matrix

$$\hat{S}_i = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ (\hat{S}_i)_{1,0} & I_p & 0_p & \cdots \\ (\hat{S}_i)_{2,0} & (\hat{S}_i)_{2,1} & I_p & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \qquad \hat{H} = \operatorname{diag}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \dots).$$

Consequently, the Geronimus–Uvarov transformation provides a new family of matrix biorthogonal polynomials

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}(x) = \hat{S}_1\chi(x), \qquad \hat{P}^{[2]}(y) = \hat{S}_2\chi(y),$$

with respect to the perturbed sesquilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\hat{u}}$.

3.1. **The resolvent and connection formulas for the matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation.**

Definition 39. *The resolvent matrix is given by*

$$\omega := \hat{S}_1 W_C(\Lambda)(S_1)^{-1}. \tag{59}$$

Proposition 44. i) *The resolvent matrix can be also expressed as*

$$\omega = \hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top} W_G(\Lambda^\top)\big(S_2\big)^\top H^{-1}. \tag{60}$$

ii) *The resolvent matrix is a block banded matrix —with only the first N_G block subdiagonals the main diagonal and the N_C block superdiagonals possibly not zero, i.e.,*

$$\omega = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{0,0} & \omega_{0,1} & \dots & \dots & \omega_{0,N_C-1} & I_p & 0_p & \dots & & \\ \omega_{1,0} & \omega_{1,1} & \dots & \dots & \omega_{1,N_C-1} & \omega_{1,N_C} & I_p & \ddots & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & & \ddots & & \ddots & & \\ \omega_{N_G,0} & \omega_{N_G,1} & & & & & \omega_{N_G,N_C+N_G-1} & I_p & 0_p & \\ 0_p & \omega_{N_G+1,1} & & & & & \omega_{N_G+1,N_G+N_C-1} & \omega_{N_G+1,N_G+N_C} & I_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

iii) *The following connection formulas are satisfied*

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = \omega P^{[1]}(x), \tag{61}$$

$$\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top \hat{H}^{-1}\omega = W_G(y)\big(P^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top H^{-1}. \tag{62}$$

iv) *For the last resolvent subdiagonal we have*

$$\omega_{N_G+k,k} = \hat{H}_{N_G+k} A_{G,N_G}(H_k)^{-1}, \tag{63}$$

where A_{G,N_G} is the leading coefficient of the perturbing matrix polynomial $W_G(x)$.

Proof. i) Proposition 43 and the Gauss–Borel factorizations of the Gram matrices G and $\hat{G}$ lead to

$$W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1} H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top} = \big(\hat{S}_1\big)^{-1}\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top} W_G(\Lambda^\top),$$

so that

$$\hat{S}_1 W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1} H = \hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top} W_G(\Lambda^\top)\big(S_2\big)^\top,$$

and the result follows. Propositions 18 and 21 ensure all the mentioned steps.[2]

[2] A detailed version is

$$W_C(\Lambda)\Big(\big(S_1\big)^{-1}H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top}\Big) = \Big(\big(\hat{S}_1\big)^{-1}\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}\Big)W_G(\Lambda^\top) \overset{P21}{\Rightarrow} \Big(W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1}\Big)H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top} = \big(\hat{S}_1\big)^{-1}\Big(\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^\top)\Big)$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{S}_1\Big(\Big(W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1}\Big)H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top}\Big) = \hat{S}_1\Big(\big(\hat{S}_1\big)^{-1}\Big(\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^\top)\Big)\Big) \overset{P18}{\Rightarrow} \Big(\hat{S}_1\Big(W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1}\Big)H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top} = \Big(\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^\top)\Big)$$

$$\Rightarrow \Big(\Big(\hat{S}_1\Big(W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1}\Big)H\big(S_2\big)^{-\top}\Big)\big(S_2\big)^\top = \Big(\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^\top)\Big)\big(S_2\big)^\top \overset{P18}{\Rightarrow} \Big(\hat{S}_1\Big(W_C(\Lambda)\big(S_1\big)^{-1}\Big)H = \Big(\hat{H}\big(\hat{S}_2\big)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^\top)\Big)\big(S_2\big)^\top.$$

ii) From its definition, the resolvent matrix is a lower generalized Hessenberg block matrix, with N_C nonzero superdiagonals. However, from (60) we deduce that it is an upper generalized block Hessenberg matrix with N_G nonzero subdiagonals. As a conclusion, we get the band structure. Propositions 18 and 21 ensure all the mentioned steps.
iii) From the resolvent's definition we deduce (61), and (60) gives (62).
iv) Direct observation from (60).

□

Proposition 45. *The matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation of the second kind functions satisfy*

$$\hat{C}^{[1]}(x)W_G(x) - \begin{bmatrix} \left(\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[N_G]}\mathcal{B}_G(\chi(x))_{[N_G]} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \omega C^{[1]}(x), \tag{64}$$

$$\left(\hat{C}^{[2]}(x)\right)^{\top}\hat{H}^{-1}\omega = W_C(x)\left(C^{[2]}(x)\right)^{\top}H^{-1} - \left[(\chi(x))^{\top}_{[N_C]}(\mathcal{B}_C)^{\top}\left(S_1\right)^{-1}_{[N_C]}, 0_p, \dots\right]. \tag{65}$$

Proof. We proceed with the proof of (64)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}^{[1]}(z)W_G(z) - \omega C^{[1]}(z) &= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}} W_G(z) - \left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{u} \\ &= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \frac{W_G(z)-W_G(y)}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}}\end{aligned}$$

and the results follows as in he Geronimus case.

For (65) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\hat{C}^{[2]}(z)\right)^{\top}\hat{H}^{-1}\omega - W_C(z)\left(C^{[2]}(z)\right)^{\top}H^{-1} &= \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, \hat{P}^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{\hat{u}} \hat{H}^{-1}\omega - W_C(z)\left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{u} \\ &= \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, \left(\hat{H}^{-1}\omega\right)^{\top}\hat{P}^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{\hat{u}} - \left\langle \frac{W_C(z)}{z-x}, P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{u} \\ &= \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, H^{-\top}P^{[2]}(y)(W_G(y))^{\top}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}} - \left\langle \frac{W_C(z)}{z-x}, P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{u} \\ &= -\left\langle \frac{W_C(x)-W_C(z)}{x-z}, P^{[2]}(y)\right\rangle_{u}.\end{aligned}$$

Again we using the ideas of the proof for the Geronimus case the result follows. □

Remark 27. *We can understand the matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation as a composition of a Geronimus transformation and a Christoffel transformation, in this order. Indeed, we can write it in terms of the corresponding matrices of generalized kernels* $u_{x,y} \mapsto \check{u}_{x,y} \mapsto \hat{u}_{x,y}$ *where*

$$\check{u}_{x,y}W_G(y) = u_{x,y}, \qquad \hat{u}_{x,y} = W_C(x)\check{u}_{x,y}.$$

At the level of the Gram matrices we will have

$$\check{G}W_G(\Lambda^{\top}) = G, \qquad \hat{G} = W_C(\Lambda)\check{G}.$$

In this paper, the Geronimus–Uvarov transformation can be performed in two steps, i.e., $\check{G}$ *has a Gauss–Borel factorization.*[3] *This leads to the following relations*

$$\left(\check{S}_1\right)^{-1}\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^{\top}) = \left(S_1\right)^{-1}H\left(S_2\right)^{-\top}, \qquad \left(\hat{S}_1\right)^{-1}\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top} = W_C(\Lambda)\left(\check{S}_1\right)^{-1}\check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top},$$

and to the associated Geronimus and Christoffel resolvent matrices

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_G &:= \check{S}_1\left(S_1\right)^{-1} = \check{H}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{-\top}W_G(\Lambda^{\top})S_2H^{-1}, \\ \omega_C &:= \hat{S}_1W_C(\Lambda)\left(\check{S}_1\right)^{-1} = \hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\left(\check{S}_2\right)^{\top}\check{H}^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

By P18 or P21 we indicated that is due to the corresponding Propositions.

[3]Recall that G and $\hat{G}$ do have such factorization by assumption.

The Geronimus resolvent matrix ω_G is a lower unitriangular block semi-infinite matrix with only the first N_G subdiagonals non-zero, and ω_C is an upper triangular block semi-infinite matrix with only the N_C first superdiagonals non-zero. The resolvent ω results from the composition of both transformations, so that it factors as $\omega = \omega_C \omega_G$.

3.2. **Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation and Christoffel–Darboux kernels.**

Definition 40. *We introduce the resolvent* wings *matrices*

$$\Omega^G[n] := \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{n,n-N_G} & \cdots & \cdots & \omega_{n,n-1} \\ 0_p & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_p & \cdots & 0_p & \omega_{n+N_G-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_G p \times N_G p}, & n \geqslant N_G, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{n,0} & \cdots & \cdots & \omega_{n,n-1} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \omega_{N_G,0} & & & \omega_{N_G,n-1} \\ 0_p & \ddots & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_p & \cdots & 0_p & \omega_{n+N_G-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_G p \times np}, & n < N_G, \end{cases}$$

$$\Omega^C[n] := \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_p & \cdots & 0_p & 0_p \\ \omega_{n-N_C+1,n} & I_p & \ddots & 0_p & 0_p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & I_p & 0_p \\ \omega_{n-1,n} & \cdots & & \omega_{n-1,n+N_C-2} & I_p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_C p \times N_C p}, & n \geqslant N_C, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{0,n} & \cdots & \omega_{0,N_C-1} & I_p & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \omega^{[1]}_{n-1,n} & \cdots & & \cdots & \omega_{n-1,n+N_C-2} & I_p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{np \times N_C p}, & n < N_C. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 5 (Matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation and connection formulas for the Christoffel–Darboux kernels)**.** *For $m_G = \min(n, N_G)$ and $m_C = \min(n, N_C)$, the perturbed and original Christoffel–Darboux kernels are connected through*

$$\hat{K}_{n-1}(x,y)W_C(x) = W_G(y)K_{n-1}(x,y) \tag{66}$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \cdots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p \times m_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p \times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P^{[1]}_{n-m_G}(x) \\ \vdots \\ P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $n \geqslant N_G$, the mixed Christoffel–Darboux kernels satisfy

$$\hat{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y)W_G(x) = W_G(y)K^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) + \mathcal{V}_G(x,y) \tag{67}$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \cdots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p \times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p \times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \vdots \\ C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. For the first connection formulas (66) we consider the pairing

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y) := \left[\left(\hat{P}_0^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_0)^{-1},\cdots,\left(\hat{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix}P_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and compute it in two different ways. From (61) we get that

$$\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix}P_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\hat{P}_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ \hat{P}_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix} W_C(x) - \tilde{\Omega}^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_n^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

where we have used the notation

$$\tilde{\Omega}^C[n] := \begin{cases}\begin{bmatrix}0_{(n-N_c)p\times N_c p}\\ \Omega^C[n]\end{bmatrix}, & n \geqslant N_C,\\ \Omega^C[n], & n < N_C.\end{cases}$$

Therefore, for $m_C = \min(N_C, n)$, we can write

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y) = \hat{K}_{n-1}(x,y)W_C(x) - \left[\left(\hat{P}_{n-m_C}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\ldots,\left(\hat{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_n^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}.$$

For $m_G = \min(n, N_G)$, relation (62) yields

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(x,y) = W_G(y)K_{n-1}(x,y) - \left[\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_n)^{-1},\ldots,\left(\hat{P}_{n+N_G-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^G[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_{n-m_G}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&W_G(y)K_{n-1}(x,y) - \left[\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_n)^{-1},\ldots,\left(\hat{P}_{n+N_G-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^G[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_{n-m_G}^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix}\\ &\quad= \hat{K}_{n-1}(x,y)W_C(x) - \left[\left(\hat{P}_{n-m_C}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\ldots,\left(\hat{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}P_n^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

and (66) follows.

Next, we consider the pairing

$$\mathcal{K}_{n-1}^{(pc)}(x,y) := \left[\left(\hat{P}_0^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_0)^{-1},\ldots,\left(\hat{P}_{n-1}^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\omega_{[n]}\begin{bmatrix}C_0^{[1]}(x)\\ \vdots\\ C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

which, we calculate in two different ways. First, using (64) we get

$$\mathcal{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) = \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_0(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_0)^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\left(\begin{bmatrix}\hat{C}^{[1]}_0(x)W_G(x)\\ \vdots\\ \hat{C}^{[1]}_{n-1}(x)W_G(x)\end{bmatrix} - \left(\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N_G]}\mathcal{B}_G(\chi(x))_{[N_G]}\right)$$
$$= \hat{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y)W_G(x) - \left((\chi(y))_{[n]}\right)^\top\left(\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^\top\hat{H}^{-1}\right)_{[n]}\left(\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N_G]}\mathcal{B}_G(\chi(x))_{[N_G]}$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_0(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_0)^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\tilde{\Omega}^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}C^{[1]}_n(x)\\ \vdots\\ C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

where, again, $\left(\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\right)_{[n,N_G]}$ denotes the truncation to the n first block rows and first N_G block columns of $\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}$. This simplifies, for $n \geqslant N_G$, to

$$\mathcal{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) = \hat{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y)W_G(x) - \left((\chi(y))_{[N_G]}\right)^\top\mathcal{B}_G(\chi(x))_{[N_G]}$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}C^{[1]}_n(x)\\ \vdots\\ C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x)\end{bmatrix}.$$

Second, from (62)

$$\mathcal{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) = W_G(y)K^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) - \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_n)^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^G[n]\begin{bmatrix}C^{[1]}_{n-m_G}(x)\\ \vdots\\ C^{[1]}_{n-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

and, consequently, we obtain

$$\hat{K}^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y)W_G(x) - \mathcal{V}_G(x,y) - \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^C[n]\begin{bmatrix}C^{[1]}_n(x)\\ \vdots\\ C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x)\end{bmatrix}$$
$$= W_G(y)K^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) - \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_n)^{-1},\dots,\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]\Omega^G[n]\begin{bmatrix}C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x)\\ \vdots\\ C^{[1]}_{n-1}(x)\end{bmatrix}.$$

□

3.3. **On the first family of linearly spectral transformed second kind functions.** In the next sections we will assume that the perturbing polynomials are monic, $W_G(x) = I_p x^N + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} A_{G,k}x^k$, $W_C(x) = I_p x^N + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} A_{C,k}x^k$. The corresponding spectral data, eigenvalues, algebraic multiplicities, partial multiplicities, left and right root polynomials and Jordan pairs and triples will have a subindex C or G to indicate to which polynomial $W_C(x)$ or $W_G(x)$ they are linked to.

Proposition 46. *The most general matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation is given by*

(68)

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} := W_C(x)u_{x,y}(W_G(y))^{-1} + v_{x,y}, \quad v_{x,y} := \sum_{a=1}^{q_G}\sum_{j=1}^{s_{G,a}}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}_{G,j}-1}\frac{(-1)^m}{m!}W_C(x)\left(\xi^{[a]}_{j,m}\right)_x \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_{G,a})l^{(a)}_{G,j}(y),$$

expressed in terms of the spectrum $\sigma(W_G(y)) = \{x_{G,a}\}_{a=1}^{q_G}$, *number of Jordan blocks* $s_{G,a}$, *partial multiplicities* $\kappa^{(a)}_{G,j}$, *and corresponding adapted left root polynomials* $l^{(a)}_{G,j}(y)$ *of the matrix polynomial* $W_G(y)$ *and* $\left(\xi^{[a]}_{j,m}\right)_x \in \left(\mathbb{C}^p[x]\right)'$.

Remark 28. *Observe that the functional $v_{x,y}$ is associated with the eigenvalues and left root vectors of the perturbing polynomial $W_G(x)$. Also notice that we have introduced $W_C(x)$ in this term. In general, we have $N_G p \geqslant \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{s_a}\kappa_j^{(a)}$ and we can not ensure the equality, up to for the nonsingular leading coefficient case.*

Remark 29. *We could also consider diagonal supported masses, with*

$$v_{x,x} = \sum_{a=1}^{q_G}\sum_{j=1}^{s_{G,a}}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}-1}\frac{(-1)^m}{m!}W_C(x)\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\delta^{(m)}(x-x_{G,a})l_{G,j}^{(a)}(x), \tag{69}$$

For these sesquilinear forms we have

$$\langle P(x),Q(y)\rangle_{\hat{u}} = \left\langle P(x)W_C(x),Q(y)(W_G(y))^{-\top}\right\rangle_u + \sum_{a=1}^{q_G}\sum_{j=1}^{s_{G,a}}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}-1}\left\langle P(x)W_C(x),\left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle\frac{1}{m!}\left(l_{G,j}^{(a)}(y)\left(Q(y)\right)^{\top}\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)}.$$

Definition 41. *For $z\neq x_{G,a}$, we introduce the $p\times p$ matrices*

$$\hat{C}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z) := \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x),\left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)}\mathcal{L}_{G,i}^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{I_p}{(z-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_i^{(a)}}}\\ \vdots\\ \frac{I_p}{z-x_{G,a}}\end{bmatrix}, \tag{70}$$

where $i=1,\dots,s_{G,a}$.

Proposition 47. *For Hankel masses as in* (69) *we have*

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x),\left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{\hat{P}_n^{[1]}W_C}(x_{G,a})\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\eta_{G,i}^{(a)},\qquad \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x),\left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle = \mathcal{J}^{(i)}_{P_n^{[1]}}(x_{G,a})\mathcal{X}_i^{(a)}\eta_{G,i}^{(a)}.$$

Proposition 48. *For $z\notin \operatorname{supp}_y(\hat{u}) = \operatorname{supp}_y(u)\cup\sigma(W_G(y))$, the following expression*

$$\hat{C}_n^{[1]}(z) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x),\frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} + \sum_{a=0}^{q_G}\sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}}\hat{C}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z)$$

holds true.

Proof. From (28) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_n^{[1]}(z) &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x),\frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}}\\ &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x),\frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} + \sum_{a=0}^{q_G}\sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_{G,i}^{(a)}-1}\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x),\left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle\frac{1}{m!}\left(\frac{l_{G,i}^{(a)}(x)}{(z-x)}\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)},\end{aligned}$$

and we deduce the result. □

Lemma 10. *The function $\hat{C}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(b)}(x)\in\mathbb{C}^p[x]$ satisfies*

$$\hat{C}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(b)}(x) = \begin{cases}\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x),\left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle\eta_{G,i}^{(a)}\begin{bmatrix}(x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,\max(i,j)}^{(a)}-\kappa_{G,i}^{(a)}}\\ \vdots\\ (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,\max(i,j)}^{(a)}-1}\end{bmatrix}w_{G,i,j}^{(a)}(x)+(x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}}T^{(a,a)}(x), & a=b,\\ (x-x_{G,b})^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(b)}}T^{(a,b)}(x), & a\neq b,\end{cases} \tag{71}$$

where the $\mathbb{C}^p$-valued function $T^{(a,b)}(x)$ is analytic at $x=x_{G,b}$ and, in particular, $T^{(a,a)}(x)\in\mathbb{C}^p[x]$.

Proof. The function $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(b)}(x) \in \mathbb{C}^p[x]$, with $a \neq b$, as (5) inform us about, is such that

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(b)}(x) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_i^{(a)} \mathcal{L}_{G,i}^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{I_p}{(x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G.i}^{(a)}}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_{G,a}} \end{bmatrix} W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(b)}(x)$$

$$= (x-x_{G,b})^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(b)}} T^{(a,b)}(x),$$

where $T^{(a,b)}(x)$ is $\mathbb{C}^p$-valued analytic function at $x = x_{G,b}$. (70) and Lemma 4 yield

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} \mathcal{L}_i^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{I_p}{(x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,i}^{(a)}}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{I_p}{x-x_{G,a}} \end{bmatrix} W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x)$$

$$= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{(x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,i}^{(a)}}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{x-x_{G,a}} \end{bmatrix} l_i^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x)$$

$$+ (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}} \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} T^{(a,a)}(x),$$

for some $T^{(a,a)}(x) \in \mathbb{C}^p[x]$. Hence, using Proposition 11 we get

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x)W_G(x)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,\max(i,j)}^{(a)} - \kappa_{G,i}^{(a)}} \\ \vdots \\ (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,\max(i,j)}^{(a)} - 1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\times \left(w_{G,i,j;0}^{(a)} + w_{G,i,j;1}^{(a)}(x-x_{G,a}) + \cdots + w_{G,i,j;\kappa_{G,\min(i,j)}^{(a)}+N_G-2}^{(a)} (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,\min(i,j)}^{(a)}+N_G-2} \right).$$

$$+ (x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}} \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} T^{(a,a)}(x),$$

and the result follows. □

Lemma 11. *The following relations hold*

$$\left(\hat{C}_n^{[1]}(z)W_G(z)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z)\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}} \left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(z)W_G(z)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z)\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)}, \tag{72}$$

for $m = 0, \ldots, \kappa_{G,j}^{(a)} - 1$.

Proof. For $z \notin \operatorname{supp}(u) \cup \sigma(W_G)$, Proposition 48 leads to

$$\left(\hat{C}_n^{[1]}(z)W_G(z)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z)\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} = \left(\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} W_G(z)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z) \right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} + \sum_{b=0}^{q_G} \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,b}} \left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(b)}(z)W_G(z)r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z)\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)}.$$

Since $\sigma(W_G(y))) \cap \operatorname{supp}_y(u) = \varnothing$, the derivatives of the Cauchy kernel $1/(z-y)$ are analytic at $z = x_{G,a}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} W_G(z) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z) \right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\frac{W_G(z) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z)}{z-y} \right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} \right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} \\ &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \sum_{k=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} (W_G(z) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(z))_{x_{G,a}}^{(k)} \frac{(-1)^{m-k}(m-k)!}{(x_{G,a}-y)^{m-k+1}} \right\rangle_{W_C u W_G^{-1}} \\ &= 0_{p\times 1},\end{aligned}$$

for $m = 1, \dots, \kappa_{G,j}^{(a)} - 1$. From (71) we know that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(b)}(x) W_G(x) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x)$, $b \neq a$, has a zero at $z = x_{G,a}$ of order $\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}$, so that

$$\left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(b)}(x) W_G(x) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} = 0, \qquad b \neq a,$$

for $m = 0, \dots, \kappa_{G,j}^{(a)} - 1$. □

Proposition 49. *The following formulas*

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}} \mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W_G}(x_{G,a}), \qquad \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}} \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W_G}(x_{G,a}), \tag{73}$$

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{G,\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{G,i,j}^{(a)}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi_i^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{G,i}^{(a)}, \tag{74}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G^{(a)}, \qquad \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G} = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G, \tag{75}$$

hold true.

Proof. Formula (73) is deduced from (72). To show (74), let us notice that according to (71), for $m = 0, \dots, \kappa_{G,j}^{(a)} - 1$, we know that

$$\left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n;i}^{(a)}(x) W_G(x) r_{G,j}^{(a)}(x)\right)_{x=x_{G,a}}^{(m)} = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \eta_{G,i}^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} \left((x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa^{(a)}_{G,\max(i,j)} - \kappa^{(a)}_{G,i}} w^{(a)}_{G,i,j}(x) \right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ \left((x-x_{G,a})^{\kappa^{(a)}_{G,\max(i,j)} - 1} w^{(a)}_{G,i,j}(x) \right)_{x_{G,a}}^{(m)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For (75), from (74) and (73) we get

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}} \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{G,i,j}^{(a)}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}_n^{[1]} W_G}(x_{G,a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{G,a}} \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) W_C(x), \left(\xi^{[a]}\right)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_{G,i}^{(a)}.$$

□

3.4. **Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas.** We assume that the leading terms of both perturbing polynomials, A_{G,N_G} and A_{C,N_C}, are nonsingular.

3.4.1. *Discussion for* $n \geqslant N_G$.

Remark 30. *In Corollary 3, with the aid of a mixed spectral/nonspectral approach, we will check that for* $A_{G,N}$ *nonsingular we have*

$$\begin{vmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{vmatrix} \neq 0.$$

Proposition 50. *For $n \geqslant N_G$, the resolvent can be expressed as follows*

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right] =$$
$$-\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}},\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Proof. The connection formula (64) gives for $n \geqslant N_G$

$$\hat{C}^{[1]}_n(x)W_G(x)=\sum_{k=n-N_G}^{n+N_C}\omega_{n,k}C^{[1]}_k(x).$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$\mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}^{[1]}_n W_G}=\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}\end{bmatrix}+\mathcal{J}_{C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}.$$

Now, from (61), we conclude

$$\left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x)W_C(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle=\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\\ \vdots\\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle\end{bmatrix}+\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle. \tag{76}$$

Recalling (75) we obtain

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_C}}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}\end{bmatrix}+\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}$$
$$=\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\\ \vdots\\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),\left(\xi^{[a]}\right)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}+\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G.$$

In other words

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G.\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G.\end{bmatrix}=-\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right).$$

From (61) we also get

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}\\ \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}\end{bmatrix}+\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}=0. \tag{77}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]&\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G.\end{bmatrix}\\ &=-\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}},\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G.\right].\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 6 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas)**.** *For monic Geronimus–Uvarov perturbations, with masses as described in* (68)*, when* $n \geqslant N_G$*, we have the following last quasideterminant expressions for the perturbed biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its matrix norms*

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x)W_C(x)=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x)\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x)\end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}_n=\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & H_{n-N_G}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p\end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\right)^{\top}=-\Theta_*\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & H_{n-N_G}\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G+1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p\\ \vdots & \vdots & \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p\\ W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y) & W_G(y)\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y)-\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)+\mathcal{J}_{G,v}(y) & 0_p\end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Relation (61) gives

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x)W_C(x)=P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x)+\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix}P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},\tag{78}$$

and, applying Proposition 50, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x)W_C(x)=P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x)&-\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}},\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right]\\ &\times\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}-\left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_G-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x)\\ \vdots\\ P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x)\end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

and the result is proven. From (63) we deduce

$$\hat{H}_n=\omega_{n,n-N_G}H_{n-N_G}.$$

According to Proposition 50 we conclude

$$\omega_{n,n-N_C} = -\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right] \times \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_G-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the second family of biorthogonal matrix polynomials we proceed as follows. First, recalling to Definition 14 we write (67) in the following way

$$(79)\quad \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_k(y)\right)^\top \hat{H}_k^{-1} \hat{C}^{[1]}_k(x) W_G(x) = W_G(y) K^{(pc)}_{n-1}(x,y) + \mathcal{V}_G(x,y)$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \vdots \\ C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The corresponding spectral jets fulfill

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_k(y)\right)^\top \hat{H}_k^{-1} \mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}^{[1]}_k W_G} = W_G(y) \mathcal{J}_{G,K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\mathcal{V}}(y)$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

From (75) we conclude

$$(80)\quad \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_k(y)\right)^\top \hat{H}_k^{-1} \left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}_k(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G = W_G(y) \mathcal{J}_{G,K^{(pc)}_{n-1}}(y) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\mathcal{V}}(y)$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} \end{bmatrix},$$

while, from (66), we realize that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_k(y)\right)^\top \hat{H}_k^{-1} \left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}_k(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G = W_G(y) \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G$$
$$- \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \ldots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots \\ \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix},$$

which can be subtracted to (80) to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_G(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{G,K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) - \langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\, \mathcal{W}_G\big) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\nu}(y) \\
= \left[\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\dots,\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]
\begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p}\end{bmatrix} \\
\times \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

(66) also implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(81)\quad W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y) \\
&= \left[\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1},\dots,\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]
\begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p}\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}}\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left[W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y), W_G(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{G,K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) - \langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\, \mathcal{W}_G\big) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\nu}(y)\right] \\
&\qquad\times \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}^{-1} \\
&(82)\qquad = \left[\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1} \quad\cdots\quad \big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\big)^\top(\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1}\right]
\begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p\times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p\times N_C p}\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, from Definition 40 and the fact $\omega_{n,n-N_G} = \hat{H}_n\big(H_{n-N_G}\big)^{-1}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\big(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y)\big)^\top = &\left[W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y), W_G(y)\big(\mathcal{J}_{G,K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) - \langle K_{n-1}(x,y),(\xi)_x\rangle\, \mathcal{W}_G\big) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\nu}(y)\right] \\
&\times \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x),(\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\end{bmatrix}^{-1}
\begin{bmatrix} H_{n-N_G} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p\end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned}
$$

and the result follows. □

Remark 31. *For a mass term $\nu_{x,y}$ as in* (69) *the previous Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas read*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & H_{n-N_G} \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = -\Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & H_{n-N_G} \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n-N_G+1}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T}_G & 0_p \\ W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y) & W_G(y)\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,K_{n-1}^{(pc)}}(y) - \mathcal{J}_{G,K_{n-1}}(y)\mathcal{T}_G\right) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\nu}(y) & 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

3.4.2. *Discussion for $n < N_G$.*

Proposition 51. *We have that*

$$\omega\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right] = -\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{N_C p} & \mathcal{B}_G \mathcal{Q}_G \\ 0_{N_C p} & 0_{N_G p} \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. From (64) we deduce

$$\mathcal{J}_{G,\hat{C}^{[1]}W_G} - \hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\mathcal{B}_G\mathcal{J}_{G,\mathcal{X}} = \omega\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}}.$$

Recalling (75) we obtain

$$\left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}(x)W_C(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G - \hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\mathcal{B}_G\mathcal{J}_{G,\mathcal{X}} = \omega\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}}.$$

Therefore, using (61) we conclude

$$\omega\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right) = -\hat{H}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}\mathcal{B}_G\mathcal{J}_{G,\mathcal{X}}. \tag{83}$$

Observe that (61) also implies

$$\omega\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}} = 0.$$

□

Given a block matrix A we denote by $A_{[N],[M]}$ the truncation obtained by taking the first N block rows and the first M first block columns.

Lemma 12. *The following relation*

(84)

$$\omega_{[N_G],[N_C+N_G]}\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right]_{[N_C+N_G]} \operatorname{diag}(I_{N_C}, \mathcal{R}_G) = \left[0_{N_G p \times N_C p}, -\hat{H}_{[N_G]}\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}_{[N_G]}\right]$$

holds.

Lemma 13. *The matrix $\left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]}$ is nonsingular.*

Proof. It follows immediately from

$$\left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]} = \left(S_1\right)_{[N_C]}\mathcal{R}_C,$$

and the fact that $\mathcal{R}_C$ is nonsingular. □

Lemma 14. *The equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
-\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right]_{[N_C+N_G]} \operatorname{diag}(I_{N_C}, \mathcal{R}_G) \\
= \left[\begin{array}{c} I_{[N_C]} \quad 0_{pN_C\times pN_G} \\ \hline \omega_{[N_G],[N_C+N_G]} \end{array}\right]^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]} & 0_{pN_C\times pN_G} \\ 0_{pN_G\times pN_C} & \hat{H}_{[N_G]} \end{bmatrix} \\
\times \begin{bmatrix} I_{[N_C]} & \left(\left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)_{[N_C],[N_G]}\mathcal{R}_G \\ 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} & \left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}_{[N_G]} \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

is fulfilled.

Proof. (84) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\left[\begin{array}{c} I_{[N_C]} \quad 0_{pN_C\times pN_G} \\ \hline \omega_{[N_G],[N_C+N_G]} \end{array}\right] \left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right]_{[N_C+N_G]} \operatorname{diag}(I_{N_C}, \mathcal{R}_G) \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]} & 0_{pN_C\times pN_G} \\ 0_{pN_G\times pN_C} & \hat{H}_{[N_G]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{[N_C]} & \left(\left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)_{[N_C],[N_G]}\mathcal{R}_G \\ 0_{N_G p\times N_C p} & \left(\left(\hat{S}_2\right)_{[N_G]}\right)^{-\top} \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. □

Lemma 15. *For* $n \in \{1, \dots, N_G - 1\}$ *we find the following expressions*

$$\hat{H}_n = -\Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n-1}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\omega_{n,k} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & e_k \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{N_C+n}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & \end{bmatrix}, \qquad 0 \leqslant k < N_C + n,$$

$$\left(\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{\top}\right)_{n,k} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n-1}} & \left(\mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1]}_{n-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), (\xi)_x\right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right)\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ & \left(e_{N_C+k}\right)^{\top} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad 0 \leqslant k < N_G.$$

Theorem 7 (Spectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas)**.** *For* $n < N$ *and monic Geronimus–Uvarov perturbations, with masses as described in* (68)*, we have the following last quasideterminant expressions for the perturbed*

biorthogonal matrix polynomials

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & P_n^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n}^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_{N_C+n}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G)\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & P_{n+N_C+n}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{85}$$

$$\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_0^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G)\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n-1}^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G)\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ 0_{p\times pN_C} & \left(\chi_{[N_G]}(y)\right)^\top \end{bmatrix}. \tag{86}$$

Proof. From (61) and (9) for $n < N_G$ we have

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = P_{N_C+n}^{[1]}(x) + \left[\omega_{n,0}, \dots, \omega_{n,N_C+n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} P_0^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots \\ P_{N_C+n-1}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}\right)^\top(y) = I_p y^n + \left[I_p, \dots, I_p y^{n-1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} \left((\hat{S}_2)^\top\right)_{0,n} \\ \vdots \\ \left((\hat{S}_2)^\top\right)_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, Lemma 7 proves the result. □

Remark 32. *For masses as in* (69) *the previous formulas reduces to*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_0^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & P_n^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n}^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_{N_C+n}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{N_C+n}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{G,n} & P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_0^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_0^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n-1}^{[1]}} & (\mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-1}^{[1]}} - \mathcal{J}_{G,P_{N_C+n-1}^{[1]}}\mathcal{T})\mathcal{R}_{G,n+1} \\ 0_{p\times pN_C} & \left(\chi_{[N_G]}(y)\right)^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

3.5. **Mixed spectral/nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas.** We consider the Geronimus–Uvarov transformation as a composition of a first Geronimus transformation, applying nonspectral techniques, and then a Christoffel transformation, for which we can apply spectral techniques. In this situation, we still require the leading coefficient A_{C,N_C} to be nonsingular, i.e. similar to monic, but we free $W_G(x)$ of such a condition. Thus, we consider

$$\check{u}_{x,y} := u_{x,y}(W_G(y))^{-1} + v_{x,y}, \tag{87}$$

with $v_{x,y}$ a matrix of bivariate generalized functions such that $v_{x,y}W_G(y) = 0_p$ so that, after a Christoffel transformation, the Geronimus–Uvarov transformation is achieved

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} = W_C(x)\check{u}_{x,y}.$$

As for the Geronimus case, we consider

Definition 42. *For a given perturbed matrix of functionals* $\check{u}$ *we define a semi-infinite block matrix of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} R &:= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{\check{u}} \\ &= \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{uW_G^{-1}} + \left\langle P^{[1]}(x), \chi(y) \right\rangle_{v_G}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 52. *The equations*

$$\mathsf{R} = \mathsf{S}_1 \check{\mathsf{G}}, \tag{88}$$

$$\omega \mathsf{R} = \hat{\mathsf{H}} \big(\hat{\mathsf{S}}_2\big)^{-\top} \tag{89}$$

are fulfilled.

Proof. Relation (88) is a consequence of its definition. Let us show (89)

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \mathsf{R} &= \hat{\mathsf{S}}_1 W_{\mathsf{C}}(\Lambda) \big(\mathsf{S}_1\big)^{-1} \mathsf{S}_1 \check{\mathsf{G}} \\ &= \hat{\mathsf{S}}_1 W_{\mathsf{C}}(\Lambda) \check{\mathsf{G}} \\ &= \hat{\mathsf{S}}_1 \hat{\mathsf{G}} \\ &= \hat{\mathsf{H}} \big(\hat{\mathsf{S}}_2\big)^{-\top}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, we conclude

Proposition 53. *The matrix* R *satisfies*

$$(\omega \mathsf{R})_{n,l} = \begin{cases} 0_p, & l \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}, \\ \hat{\mathsf{H}}_n, & n = l. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{R}_{0,0} & \dots & \mathsf{R}_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathsf{R}_{n-1,0} & \dots & \mathsf{R}_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix}$ *is nonsingular.*

As for the pure Geronimus situation we consider

Definition 43. *We introduce the matrix polynomials* $\mathsf{r}^{\mathsf{K}}_{n,l}(y) \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}[y]$, $l \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, *given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{r}^{\mathsf{K}}_{n,l}(z) :&= \big\langle W_{\mathsf{G}}(z) \mathsf{K}_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l \big\rangle_{\check{u}} - I_p z^l \\ &= \big\langle W_{\mathsf{G}}(z) \mathsf{K}_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l \big\rangle_{u W_{\mathsf{G}}^{-1}} + \big\langle W(z) \mathsf{K}_{n-1}(x,z), I_p y^l \big\rangle_{\nu_{\mathsf{G}}} - I_p z^l. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 54. *For* $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ *and* $n \geqslant \mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}}$ *we have*

$$\mathsf{r}^{\mathsf{K}}_{n,l}(z) = \Big[\big(\hat{\mathsf{P}}^{[2]}_{n-m_{\mathsf{C}}}(z)\big)^{\top} (\hat{\mathsf{H}}_{n-m_{\mathsf{C}}})^{-1}, \dots, \big(\hat{\mathsf{P}}^{[2]}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}}-1}(z)\big)^{\top} (\hat{\mathsf{H}}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}}-1})^{-1} \Big] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_{\mathsf{C}} p \times \mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}} p} & -\Omega^{\mathsf{C}}[n] \\ \Omega^{\mathsf{G}}[n] & 0_{\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}} p \times \mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}} p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{R}_{n-\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}},l} \\ \vdots \\ \mathsf{R}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}-1,l} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{90}$$

Proof. It follows from (66), Definition 42 and (16). □

Definition 44. *For* $n \geqslant \mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}}$, *let us assume that the matrix*

$$\Phi_n := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{P}^{[1]}_{n-\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}}}} & \mathsf{R}_{n-\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}},0} & \dots & \mathsf{R}_{n-\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}},n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{P}^{[1]}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}-1}} & \mathsf{R}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}-1,0} & \dots & \mathsf{R}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}})p \times (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+n)p}$$

is full rank, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}(\Phi_n) = (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}})p$. *Then, we know that nonsingular square submatrices* $\Phi^{\square}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{(\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}})p \times (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}})p}$ *of* Φ_n *exist, and we will refer to them as poised submatrices. We also consider*

$$\varphi_n := \Big[\mathcal{J}_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{P}^{[1]}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}}}, \mathsf{R}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}},0}, \dots, \mathsf{R}_{n+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}},n-1} \Big] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+n)p}$$

and the square *submatrices* $\varphi^{\square}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{G}})p}$ *corresponding to the selection of columns to built the poised submatrix* $\Phi^{\square}_n$. *We also consider*

$$\varphi^{\mathsf{K}}_n(y) = \big[W_{\mathsf{G}}(y) \mathcal{J}_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{K}_{n-1}}(y), \mathsf{R}^{\mathsf{K}}_{n,0}(y), \dots, \mathsf{R}^{\mathsf{K}}_{n,n-1}(y) \big] \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times (\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{C}}+n)p}[y]$$

and $(\varphi^{\mathsf{K}}_n(y))^{\square}$.

Proposition 55. *If $A_{G,N}$ is nonsingular, then*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & R_{n-N_G,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N_G,N_G-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,N_G-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular.

Proof. From Proposition 53 we deduce the system

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N_G,l} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n+N_C-1,l} \end{bmatrix} = -R_{n+N_C,l},$$

for $l \in \{0,1,\dots,n-1\}$. In particular, the resolvent vector $\left[\omega_{n,n-N},\dots,\omega_{n,n-1}\right]$ is a solution of the linear system

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\omega_{n,n+N_C-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & R_{n-N_G,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N_G,N_G-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,N_G-1} \end{bmatrix} = -\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}, R_{n+N_C,0},\dots,R_{n+N_C,N_G-1}\right]. \tag{91}$$

Let us discuss the uniqueness of the solutions of this linear system. Assume that we have another solution

$$\left[\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N_G},\dots,\tilde{\omega}_{n,n+N_C-1}\right].$$

Then, consider the monic matrix polynomial

$$Q_{n+N_C}(x) = P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x) + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n+N_C-1}P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N_G}P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x).$$

Because $\left[\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N},\dots,\tilde{\omega}_{n,n-1}\right]$ solves (91) we conclude the two important relations

$$\mathcal{J}_{C,Q_{n+N_C}} = 0_{p,N_Cp}, \tag{92}$$

$$\langle Q_{n+N_C}(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\breve{u}} = 0_p, \qquad l \in \{0,\dots,N_G-1\}. \tag{93}$$

Using Lemma 1, (92) can be expressed as follows

$$\mathcal{J}_{C,Q_{n+N_C}} = \left[(Q_{n+N_C})_0,\dots,(Q_{n+N_C})_{n+N_C}\right]\begin{bmatrix} X_C \\ X_CJ_C \\ \vdots \\ X_C(J_C)^{n+N_C} \end{bmatrix} = 0_{p,N_Cp},$$

where (X_C, J_C) is a Jordan pair for the perturbing polynomial $W_C(x)$. According to Corollary 3.8 in [62] this is a necessary and sufficient condition for $W_C(x)$ to be a right divisor of the polynomial $Q_{n+N_C}(x)$, so that we can write

$$Q_{n+N_C}(x) = \tilde{P}_n(x)W_C(x),$$

where $\tilde{P}_n(x)$ is a degree n monic polynomial. Then, (93) reads

$$\langle \tilde{P}_n(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\hat{u}} = 0_p, \qquad l \in \{0,\dots,N_G-1\}.$$

Let us proceed as we did in Proposition 40. We first notice that Lemma 9 can be applied again to get

$$\langle P^{[1]}_m(x), I_p y^l\rangle_{\breve{u}} = \langle P^{[1]}_m(x), \beta_l(y)\rangle_{\breve{u}},$$

for $l < m + N_G$. Hence, when $l \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \tilde{P}_n(x), I_p y^l \rangle_{\check{u}} &= \langle P^{[1]}_{N_C+n}(x), I_p y^l \rangle_{\check{u}} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n+N_C-1} \langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), I_p y^l \rangle_{\check{u}} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N_G} \langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x), I_p y^l \rangle_{\check{u}} \\
&= \langle P^{[1]}_{N_C+n}(x), \beta_l(y) \rangle_{\check{u}} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n+N_C-1} \langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), \beta_l(y) \rangle_{\check{u}} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N_G} \langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x), \beta_l(y) \rangle_{\check{u}} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{N_G-1} \left(R_{n+N_C,k} + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n+N_C-1} R_{n+N_C-1,k} + \cdots + \tilde{\omega}_{n,n-N_G} R_{n-N_G,k} \right) (\beta_{l,k})^\top \\
&= 0_p.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the uniqueness of the biorthogonal polynomial families implies

$$\tilde{P}_n(x) = \hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x),$$

and, considering (61), we infer that there is a unique solution of (91). Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C, P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & R_{n-N_G,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N_G,N_G-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C, P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,N_G-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular and, therefore, it is a poised submatrix. □

Proposition 56. *For $n \geqslant N_G$ and a full rank matrix Φ_n, let us take a poised submatrix $\Phi^{\square}_n$. Then,*

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G}, \dots, \omega_{n,n+N_C-1} \right] = -\varphi^{\square}_n \left(\Phi^{\square}_n \right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. From Proposition 53 we get, for $n \geqslant N_G$,

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G}, \dots, \omega_{n,n+N_C-1} \right] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N_G,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N_G,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix} = - \left[R_{n+N_C,0}, \dots, R_{n+N_C,n-1} \right].$$

Using (77) we can extend this equation to

$$\left[\omega_{n,n-N_G}, \dots, \omega_{n,n+N_C-1} \right] \Phi_n = -\varphi_n,$$

and the result follows. □

Theorem 8 (Mixed spectral/nonspectral matrix Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas)**.** *Given a matrix Geronimus–Uvarov transformation the corresponding perturbed polynomials can be expressed, for $n \geqslant N_G$, as follows*

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x) W_C(x) = \Theta_* \left[\begin{array}{cc} & P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \Phi^{\square}_n & \vdots \\ & P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \\ \hline \varphi^{\square}_n & P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x) \end{array} \right], \qquad \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y) \right)^\top A_N = -\Theta_* \left[\begin{array}{cc} & H_{n-N_G} \\ & 0_p \\ \Phi^{\square}_n & \vdots \\ & 0_p \\ \hline \left(\varphi^K_n(y) \right)^{\square} & 0_p \end{array} \right].$$

The corresponding quasitau matrices are

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \left[\begin{array}{cc} & R_{n-N_G,n} \\ \Phi^{\square}_n & \vdots \\ & R_{n+N_C-1,n} \\ \hline \varphi^{\square}_n & R_{n+N_C,n} \end{array} \right] = \Theta_* \left[\begin{array}{cc} & H_{n-N_G} \\ & 0_p \\ \Phi^{\square}_n & \vdots \\ & 0_p \\ \hline \varphi^{\square}_n & 0_p \end{array} \right].$$

Proof. From the connection formula (61) we find

$$\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x) W_C(x) = [\omega_{n,n-N_G}, \dots, \omega_{n,n+N_C-1}] \begin{bmatrix} P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \vdots \\ P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} + P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x),$$

and from Proposition 53 we deduce

$$\hat{H}_n = [\omega_{n,n-N_G}, \dots, \omega_{n,n+N_C-1}] \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N_G,n} \\ \vdots \\ R_{n+N_C-1,n} \end{bmatrix} + R_{n+N_C,n},$$

we will also use (79). Then, the result for $\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)$ and $\hat{H}_n$ follows from Proposition 56.

From (90) and formula (81) we get

$$\varphi_n^K(y) = \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \dots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p \times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p \times N_C p} \end{bmatrix} \Phi_n,$$

so that

(94)

$$\left(\varphi_n^K(y)\right)^\square \left(\Phi_n^\square\right)^{-1} = \left[\left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n-m_C}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-m_C})^{-1}, \dots, \left(\hat{P}^{[2]}_{n+N_G-1}(y)\right)^\top (\hat{H}_{n+N_G-1})^{-1} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m_C p \times N_G p} & -\Omega^C[n] \\ \Omega^G[n] & 0_{N_G p \times N_C p} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, recalling (63) we deduce that

$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top A_N = \left(\varphi_n^K(y)\right)^\square \left(\Phi_n^\square\right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} H_{n-N} \\ 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

and the expression for the perturbation of the second family of biorthogonal polynomials follows. □

3.5.1. *Discussion for* $n < N_G$. We proceed similarly as we did in §3.4.2. Let us notice that from (61) and (88) we get

$$\omega \left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, R \right] = \hat{H} \left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top} [0, I].$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$\omega_{[N_g],[N_C+N_G]} \left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, R \right]_{[N_C+N_G]} = \left[0_{N_G p \times N_C p}, -\hat{H}_{[N_G]} \left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}_{[N_G]} \right].$$

Given a block matrix A, we denote by $A_{[N],[M]}$ the truncation obtained by taking the first N block rows and the first M block columns. Then, we easily conclude

Lemma 16. *The following Gauss-Borel factorization is fulfilled*

$$\left[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}, R \right]_{[N_C+N_G]} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} I_{[N_C]} & 0_{pN_C \times pN_G} \\ \hline \omega_{[N_G],[N_C+N_G]} & \end{array} \right]^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}}\right)_{[N_C]} & 0_{pN_C \times pN_G} \\ 0_{pN_G \times pN_C} & \hat{H}_{[N_G]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{[N_C]} & R_{[N_C],[N_G]} \\ 0_{N_G p \times N_C p} & \left(\hat{S}_2\right)^{-\top}_{[N_G]} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, for $n \in \{1, \dots, N_G - 1\}$ *we have*

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n-1}} & R_{N_C+n-1,0} & \dots & R_{N_C+n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\omega_{n,k} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n-1} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & e_k \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n}} & R_{N_C+n,0} & \dots & R_{N_C+n,n-1} & \end{bmatrix}, \qquad 0 \leqslant k < N_C + n,$$

$$\left(\left(\hat{S}_2\right)^\top\right)_{n,k} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & R_{0,0} & \dots & R_{0,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{N_C+n-1}} & R_{N_C+n,0} & \dots & R_{N_C+n,n} \\ & (e_{N_C+k})^\top & & \end{bmatrix}, \qquad 0 \leqslant k < N_G.$$

Theorem 9 (Mixed spectral/nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas)**.** *For $n < N_G$, the perturbed biorthogonal matrix polynomials have the following quasideterminatal expressions*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)W_C(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & R_{0,0} & \cdots & R_{0,n-1} & P_n^{[1]}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n}^{[1]}} & R_{N_C+n,0} & \cdots & R_{N_C+n,n-1} & P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_0^{[1]}} & R_{0,0} & \cdots & R_{0,n} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{N_C+n-1}^{[1]}} & R_{N_C+n-1,0} & \cdots & R_{N_C+n-1,n} \\ 0_{p\times pN_C} & & \left(\chi(y)_{[N_G]}\right)^\top & \end{bmatrix}.$$

Corollary 3. *If $A_{N,G}$ is nonsingular, then the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix} \tag{95}$$

is nonsingular.

Proof. Proposition 42 implies for the Geronimus part of the Geronimus–Uvarov transformation that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} R_{n-N_G,0} & & R_{n-N_G,N_G-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,N_G-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}_G, \tag{96}$$

which in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix} \\ &\qquad = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & R_{n-N_G,0} & \cdots & R_{n-N_G,N_G-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} & R_{n+N_C-1,0} & \cdots & R_{n+N_C-1,N_G-1} \end{bmatrix} \operatorname{diag}(I_{N_G p}, -\mathcal{R}_G). \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Finally, Proposition 55 and Lemma 2 give the result. □

3.6. **Applications.** We discuss in the next three subsections some extensions of the previous techniques by using the adjugate matrix. For these we need the original matrix of generalized kernels to be Hankel and, therefore, we are leading with Hankel block matrices.

3.6.1. *Christoffel transformations with singular leading coefficients for Hankel generalized kernels.* In §2.7.1, we considered unimodular Christoffel transformations, which have been broadly studied in the matrix orthogonal polynomials community, under the light of Geronimus transformations. As shown there, despite the nonspectral condition, the Geronimus transformation can be of help and provide Christoffel type formulas for the perturbed orthogonal matrix polynomials. We extend now these considerations for a Christoffel transformation with singular leading coefficient and not necessarily unimodular. For the unimodular matrix polynomial perturbation we got results for arbitrary matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y}$. However, for the singular but not unimodular

case there is a ticket to pay, namely the non perturbed matrix of generalized kernels must be of Hankel type, i.e., $u_{x,y} = u_{x,x}$.

The idea is to use the adjugate or classical adjoint of a matrix polynomial $W(x)$, see [70], $\operatorname{adj}(W(x))$ defined as the transpose of the matrix of cofactors. From the Laplace formula we know that

$$W(x)\operatorname{adj}(W(x)) = \operatorname{adj}(W(x))W(x) = \det(W(x))I_p.$$

If $N = \deg(W(x))$, we have that $\deg\big(\det(W(x))\big) \leqslant Np$ and $\deg\big(\operatorname{adj}(W(x))\big) \leqslant N(p-1)$. The relations

$$\big(W(x)\big)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det(W(x))}\operatorname{adj}(W(x)), \qquad\qquad W(x) = \det(W(x))\big(\operatorname{adj}(W(x))\big)^{-1}$$

will be instrumental in the sequel.

We study the Christoffel transformation[4] of a Hankel matrix of generalized kernels

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = u_{x,x}W(x),$$

as the following massless Geronimus–Uvarov transformation

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W_C(x)u_{x,x}\big(W_G(x)\big)^{-1}, \qquad W_C(x) := I_p\det(W(x)), \qquad W_G(x) := \operatorname{adj}(W(x)),$$

with $N_C = \deg(W_C(x)) \leqslant Np$ and $N_G = \deg(W_G(x)) \leqslant N(p-1)$. Let us remark that is the presence of an non constant determinant $\det(W(x))$ that forces for Hankel matrices $u_{x,x}$. Therefore, we could apply our results for Geronimus–Uvarov transformations, and use the mixed spectral-nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formula of Theorem 8. That is, the perturbed polynomials can be expressed, for $n \geqslant N_G$, as follows

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)\det(W(x)) = \Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \Phi_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x) \\ \hline \varphi_n^{\square} & P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}(x) \end{array}\right], \qquad \big(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^{\top}A_N = -\Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & H_{n-N_G} \\ & 0_p \\ \Phi_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & 0_p \\ \hline \big(\varphi_n^K(y)\big)^{\square} & 0_p \end{array}\right].$$

The corresponding perturbed quasitau matrices are

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_*\left[\begin{array}{cc} & R_{n-N_G,n} \\ \Phi_n^{\square} & \vdots \\ & R_{n+N_C-1,n} \\ \hline \varphi_n^{\square} & R_{n+N_C,n} \end{array}\right].$$

Let us recall that $\Phi_n^{\square} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_C+N_G)p\times(N_C+N_G)p}$, see Definition 44, is a nonsingular submatrix of

$$\Phi_n := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}} & R_{n-N_G,0} & \dots & R_{n-N_G,n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}} & R_{n+N_C,0} & \dots & R_{n+N_C,n-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_C+N_G)p\times(N_C+n)p}$$

and that $\varphi_n^{\square}, (\varphi_n^K)^{\square} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times(N_C+N_G)p}$ corresponds to the same selection of columns of

$$\varphi_n = \Big[\mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}}, R_{n+N_C,0}, \dots, R_{n+N_C,n-1}\Big] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times(N_C+n)p},$$
$$\varphi_n^K = \big[W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K_{n-1}}(y), r^K_{n,0}(y), \dots, r^K_{n,n-1}(y)\big] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times(N_C+n)p}[y].$$

Now, the R's are

$$R_{n,m} = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), y^m\frac{W(y)}{\det(W(y))}\right\rangle_u,$$

while the root spectral jet $\mathcal{J}_P$ is

$$\mathcal{J}_{C,P} = \left[P(x_1), P'(x_1), \dots, \frac{P^{(\alpha_1-1)}(x_1)}{\alpha_1!}, \dots, P(x_q), P'(x_q), \dots, \frac{P^{(\alpha_q-1)}(x_q)}{\alpha_q!}\right],$$

[4]Notice that the matrix Christoffel transformation $\hat{u} = W(x)u$ is a transposition of this one.

where x_a are the eigenvalues, with corresponding multiplicities α_a , of $W(x)$. Thus, we have the more explicit expression

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(P^{[1]}_{n-N_G})^{(\alpha_q-1)}(x_q)}{\alpha_q!} & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x), \frac{W(y)}{\det(W(y))} \right\rangle_u & \cdots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n-N_G}(x), \frac{y^{n-1}W(y)}{\det(W(y))} \right\rangle_u \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1})^{(\alpha_q-1)}(x_q)}{\alpha_q!} & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), \frac{W(y)}{\det(W(y))} \right\rangle_u & \cdots & \left\langle P^{[1]}_{n+N_C-1}(x), \frac{y^{n-1}W(y)}{\det(W(y))} \right\rangle_u \end{bmatrix}$$

from where a poised submatrix, which exists for an appropriate selection of columns, must be picked.

3.6.2. *Symmetric perturbations of Hankel matrices of generalized kernels.* For symmetric Hankel matrices of generalized kernels u, $u = u^\top$, the biorthogonality becomes an orthogonality condition, and so we have orthogonal matrix polynomials. The perturbations we have considered so far do not respect this condition. For the study of transformations preserving this symmetric condition, we are lead to the study of transformations

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W(x)u_{x,x}(W(x))^\top,$$

which we call of the symmetric Christoffel type, or (we omit the masses for sake of simplicity) the massless symmetric Geronimus perturbations

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = (W(x))^{-1}u_{x,x}(W(x))^{-\top}.$$

These transformations, that deserve further study, can be understood using the adjugate technique at the light of the Geronimus–Uvarov transformations techniques we have discussed previously in this paper. We need to assume that the leading coefficient of $W(x)$ is nonsingular, and hence, that spectral techniques could be applied. For example, the symmetric Christoffel transformation can be written as the following Geronimus–Uvarov transformation

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W_C(x)u_{x,x}(W_G(x))^{-1}, \qquad W_C(x) := (\det W(x))W(x), \qquad W_G(x) := (\operatorname{adj}(W(x)))^\top,$$

with polynomial degrees $N_C = N(p+1)$ and $N_G = N(p-1)$. The massless symmetric Geronimus transformation can be understood as the following Geronimus–Uvarov transformation

$$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W_C(x)u_{x,x}(W_G(x))^{-1}, \qquad W_C(x) := \operatorname{adj}(W(x)), \qquad W_G(x) := (\det W(x))|(W(x))^\top.$$

Now, the degrees are $N_C = N(p-1)$, $N_G = N(p+1)$, respectively. Observe that for the symmetric Christoffel transformation we have $\det W_C(x) = (\det W(x))^{p+1}$, so that eigenvalues coincide but multiplicities are multiplied by p. The same happens for the massless symmetric Geronimus transformations and $W_G(x)$. Notice also that as $\det(\operatorname{adj}(W(x))) = (\det W(x))^{p-1}$, the eigenvalues of $W_G(x)$ (of $W_C(x)$) in the symmetric Christoffel (in the symmetric Geronimus) are those $W(x)$ but with multiplicities multiplied by $p+$. Then, the massless spectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas of Theorem 6 can be applied with the corresponding perturbing polynomials $W_C(x)$ and $W_G(x)$.

3.6.3. *Nonsymmetric perturbations of Hankel matrices of generalized kernels.* We could consider a more general situation of the following nonsymmetric form, with the perturbing matrix polynomial $W(x)$ having a nonsingular leading coefficient,

$$\hat{u} = W(x)uV(x) = W_C(x)u(W_G(x))^{-1}, \qquad W_C(x) = (\det V(x))W(x), \qquad W_G(x) = \operatorname{adj}(V(x)),$$

or

$$\hat{u} = (W(x))^{-1}u(V(x))^{-1} = W_C(x)u(W_G(x))^{-1}, \qquad W_C(x) = \operatorname{adj}(W(x)), \qquad W_G(x) = (\det W(x))V(x).$$

In this case the polynomial $V(x)$ can have a singular leading coefficient, and when this happens we apply the mixed spectral/nonspectral Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formulas.

3.6.4. *Degree one Geronimus–Uvarov transformations.* We consider degree one perturbing polynomials

$$W_C(x) = xI_p - A_C, \qquad W_G(x) = xI_p - A_G,$$

and no masses. For the Jordan pairs (X_C, J_C) and (X_G, J_G) we have $A_C = X_C J_C (X_C)^{-1}$ and $A_G = X_G J_G (X_G)^{-1}$. Now, from Theorem 6 we deduce, for $n \geqslant N_G$, the following last quasideterminant expressions

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)(xI_p - A_C) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \\ P_n^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_n^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & P_n^{[1]}(x) \\ P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & P_{n+1}^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & H_{n-1} \\ P_n^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_n^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & 0_p \\ P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\big(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top = -\Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & H_{n-1} \\ P_n^{[1]}(A_C)X_C & C_n^{[1]}(A_G)X_G & 0_p \\ (yI_p - A_G)K_{n-1}(A_C, y)X_C & \big(yI_p - A_G)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(A_G, y) + I_p\big)X_G & 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we expand the quasideterminant we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)(xI_p - A_C) =& P_{n+1}^{[1]}(x) - C_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_G)\Big(C_n^{[1]}(A_G) - P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\big(P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)\big)^{-1}C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)\Big)^{-1}P_n^{[1]}(x) \\
&- C_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_G)\Big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G) - P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)\big(P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\big)^{-1}C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\Big)^{-1}P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x) \\
&- P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_C)\Big(P_n^{[1]}(A_C) - C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)\big)^{-1}P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)\Big)^{-1}P_n^{[1]}(x) \\
&- P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_C)\Big(P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C) - C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)\big(C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\big)^{-1}P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\Big)^{-1}P_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), \\
\hat{H}_n =& -\Big(C_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_G)\Big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G) - P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)\big(P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\big)^{-1}C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\Big)^{-1} \\
&+ P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A_C)\Big(P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C) - C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)\big(C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\big)^{-1}P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\Big)^{-1}\Big)H_{n-1}, \\
\big(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\big)^\top =& \Big(\big((yI_p - A_G)K_{n-1}^{(pc)}(A_G, y) + I_p\big)\Big(C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G) - P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C)\big(P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\big)^{-1}C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\Big)^{-1} \\
&+ (yI_p - A_G)K_{n-1}(A_C, y)\Big(P_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_C) - C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A_G)\big(C_n^{[1]}(A_G)\big)^{-1}P_n^{[1]}(A_C)\Big)^{-1}\Big)H_{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

4. Matrix Uvarov transformations

Uvarov perturbations for the scalar case and a number of Dirac deltas, has been considered first in §2 of [126] in the context of orthogonal polynomials with respect to a Stieltjes integral scalar product. Then, for the matrix case it was studied in a series of papers [119, 120, 121] where we can find the corresponding Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov formula for the perturbed polynomials when a solely Dirac delta is added in a point to a matrix of measures. Now we present the general case for an additive perturbation, that has a discrete finite support in the y-variable, of a sesquilinear form. We allow, therefore, for additive perturbations having, in the y-variable, an arbitrary finite number of derivatives of the Dirac delta at several different points, and arbitrary linear independent generalized functions in the x-variable. Despite the result found largely extends the Christoffel formulas in the papers of Yakhlef and coworkers, we have three more reasons to discuss this material. Firstly to show how some of the tools, like spectral jets, used in previous sections of the paper also apply in this context, secondly, to achieve a more complete account of the family of transformations of Darboux type for matrix orthogonal polynomials and thirdly to apply it to orthogonalities like that of matrix discrete Sobolev type, see [84]. For the multivariate scenario these transformations have been discussed in [39] and [38, 18].

4.1. **Additive perturbations.** We discuss here an interesting formula for additive perturbations of matrix generalized kernels. It will be instrumental when we discuss the matrix Uvarov transformation.

Proposition 57 (Additive perturbation and reproducing kernels)**.** *Let us consider an additive perturbation of the matrix of bivariate generalized functions* $u_{x,y}$ *of the form*

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y} + v_{x,y},$$

and let us assume that $u_{x,y}$ *and* $\hat{u}_{x,y}$ *are quasidefinite. Then,*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(z) = P_n^{[1]}(z) - \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(K_{n-1}(z,y)\right)^\top \right\rangle_v, \qquad (\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(z))^\top = (P_n^{[2]}(z))^\top - \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_n &= H_n + \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v \\ &= H_n + \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From (12) and (13) we deduce

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_m^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}} = 0_p, \quad \left\langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}} = 0_p, \quad m \in \{1, \dots n-1\}, \tag{98}$$

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}} = \hat{H}_n = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}}. \tag{99}$$

Equation (98) can be expressed as

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_m^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u = -\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_m^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v, \quad \left\langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u = -\left\langle P_m^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v, \quad m \in \{1, \dots n-1\}.$$

Then, recalling (14) we get

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_u = -\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_v, \quad \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u = -\left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v.$$

But, notice that $\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) - P_n^{[1]}(x)$ and $\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) - P_n^{[2]}(y)$ have degree $n-1$ and, therefore, recalling (15) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(z) - P_n^{[1]}(z) &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) - P_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_u \\ &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_u \\ &= -\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_v, \\ \left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(z) - P_n^{[2]}(z)\right)^\top &= \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) - P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u \\ &= \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u \\ &= -\left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from (99) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_n &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}} \\ &= \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u + \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v \\ &= H_n + \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), P_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v,\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_n &= \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_{\hat{u}} \\ &= \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_u + \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v \\ &= H_n + \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v.\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2. **Matrix Christoffel–Uvarov formulas for Uvarov additive perturbations.** We consider the following additive Uvarov perturbation

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y} + \nu_{x,y}, \qquad \nu_{x,y} = \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a), \qquad \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x \in \left(\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]\right)', \tag{100}$$

which has a finite support on the y variable at the set $\{x_a\}_{a=1}^{q}$. The set of linear functionals $\left\{\left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x\right\}_{\substack{a=1,\dots,q \\ m=0,\dots,\kappa^{(a)}-1}}$ is supposed to be linearly independent in the bimodule $\left(\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]\right)'$, i.e., the unique solution to

$$\sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x X_m^{(a)} = 0, \qquad X_m^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p},$$

is $X_m^{(a)} = 0_p$, and to

$$\sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} Y_m^{(a)} \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x = 0, \qquad Y_m^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p},$$

is $Y_m^{(a)} = 0_p$.

We will assume along this subsection that both $u_{x,y}$ and $u_{x,y} + \nu_{x,y}$ are quasidefinite matrices of bivariate generalized functions.

Definition 45. *We will say that the degree of the Uvarov perturbation is* $N = \kappa^{(1)} + \cdots + \kappa^{(q)}$. *The spectral jet associated with the finite support matrix of linear functionals* $\nu_{x,y}$ *is, for any sufficiently smooth matrix function* $f(x)$ *defined in an open set in* $\mathbb{R}$ *containing the support* $\{x_1, \dots, x_q\}$, *the following matrix*

$$\mathcal{J}_f = \left[f(x_1), \dots, \frac{(f(x))_{x_1}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!}, \dots, f(x_q), \dots, \frac{(f(x))_{x_q}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times Np}.$$

For a matrix of kernels $K(x,y)$, *we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_K^{[0,1]}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} K(x,x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{(K(x,y))_{x,x_1}^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} \\ \vdots \\ K(x,x_q) \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{(K(x,y))_{x,x_q}^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times p}.$$

We also require the introduction of the following matrices

$$\langle P(x), (\beta)_x \rangle := \left[\left\langle P(x), \left(\beta_0^{(1)}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle P(x), \left(\beta_{\kappa^{(1)}-1}^{(1)}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle P(x), \left(\beta_0^{(q)}\right)_x \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle P(x), \left(\beta_{\kappa^{(q)}-1}^{(q)}\right)_x \right\rangle \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times Np}.$$

Proposition 58. *The following relations*

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_\nu = \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(z),$$
$$\left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_\nu = \langle K_{n-1}(x,z), (\beta)_x \rangle \left(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top$$

are fulfilled.

Proof. Direct substitution gives

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (K_{n-1}(z,y))^\top \right\rangle_v = \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{m!} \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x \right\rangle \left(K_{n-1}(z,x)\right)_{x_a}^{(m)},$$

$$\left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y) \right\rangle_v = \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{m!} \left\langle K_{n-1}(x,z), \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x \right\rangle \left(\left(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y)\right)^\top\right)_{x_a}^{(m)},$$

and the result follows. □

Definition 46. *We define the left kernel subspace*

$$\mathrm{Ker}_\beta^R := \left\{ P(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x] : \left\langle \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x, P(x) \right\rangle = 0_p, a \in \{1,\dots,q\}, m \in \{1,\dots,\kappa^{(a)}-1\} \right\},$$

and the bilateral ideal

$$\mathbb{I} := (x-x_1)^{\kappa^{(1)}} \cdots (x-x_q)^{\kappa^{(q)}} \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x].$$

The corresponding right and left orthogonal complements with respect to the sesquilinear form are

$$\left(\mathrm{Ker}_\beta^R\right)^{\perp_u^R} := \left\{ Q(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x] : \langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u = 0_p \ \forall P(x) \in \mathrm{Ker}_\beta^R \right\},$$

$$\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R} := \left\{ Q(y) \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[y] : \langle Q(x), P(y)\rangle_u = 0_p \ \forall P(x) \in \mathbb{I} \right\}.$$

Theorem 10 (Christoffel–Uvarov formulas)**.** *Whenever one of the two conditions* $\left(\mathrm{Ker}_\beta^R\right)^{\perp_u^R} = \{0_p\}$ *or* $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^L} = \{0_p\}$ *holds, the matrix* $I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_n}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle$ *is nonsingular and the Uvarov perturbed matrix orthogonal polynomials and quasitau matrices can be expressed as follows*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x) \\ \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & \left(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top \\ \langle K_{n-1}(x,y), (\beta)_x \rangle & (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & -\left(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top \\ \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & H_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. From Propositions 57 and 58 we get

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(z) = P_n^{[1]}(z) - \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(z), \tag{101}$$

$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(z))^\top = (P_n^{[2]}(z))^\top - \langle K_{n-1}(x,z), (\beta)_x \rangle \left(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top, \tag{102}$$

which in turn imply

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle - \left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle, \tag{103}$$

$$\left(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top = \left(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top - \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}, (\beta)_x \right\rangle \left(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top, \tag{104}$$

and, consequently,

$$\left\langle \hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle\right) = \left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle, \tag{105}$$

$$\left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}, (\beta)_x \right\rangle\right) \left(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top = \left(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top. \tag{106}$$

Let us check the nonsingularity of the matrices $I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle$. If we assume the contrary, we can find a nonzero vector $X \in \mathbb{C}^{Np}$ such that

$$\left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle\right) X = 0,$$

is the zero vector in $\mathbb{C}^{Np}$, and, equivalently, a covector $Y \in (\mathbb{C}^{Np})^*$ with

$$Y\Big(I_{Np} + \Big\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle\Big) = 0.$$

Thus, using (105) and (106) we conclude that $\Big\langle P^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle X = 0$ and $Y\big(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top = 0$. The definition of the Christoffel–Darboux kernels (14) implies

$$I_{Np} + \Big\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_n}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle = I_{Np} + \Big\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle + (\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_n})^\top (H_n)^{-1} \Big\langle P^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle,$$

and, consequently, we deduce that $\Big(I_{Np} + \Big\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_n}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle\Big) X = 0$ and $Y\Big(I_{Np} + \Big\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_n}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle\Big) = 0$, so that $\Big\langle P^{[1]}_{n+1}(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle X = 0$ and $Y(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_{n+1}})^\top = 0$, and so forth and so on. Thus, we deduce that $\Big\langle P^{[1]}_k(x), (\beta)_x \Big\rangle X = 0$ and $Y(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_k})^\top = 0$ for $k \in \{n, n+1, \dots\}$. If we write

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(1)}_0 \\ \vdots \\ X^{(1)}_{\kappa^{(1)}-1} \\ \vdots \\ X^{(q)}_0 \\ \vdots \\ X^{(q)}_{\kappa^{(q)}-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y^{(1)}_0, \dots, Y^{(1)}_{\kappa^{(1)}-1}, \dots Y^{(q)}_0, \dots, Y^{(q)}_{\kappa^{(q)}-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

the linear functionals

$$\beta \cdot X := \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \big(\beta^{(a)}_m\big)_x X^{(a)}_m, \qquad Y \cdot \delta := \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} Y^{(a)}_m \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a),$$

are such that

$$\langle P^{[1]}_k(x), \beta \cdot X \rangle = 0, \qquad \Big\langle Y \cdot \delta, \big(P^{[2]}_k(x)\big)^\top \Big\rangle = 0,$$

for $k \in \{n, n+1, \dots\}$. We can say that

$$\beta \cdot X \in \big(\{P^{[1]}_k(x)\}^\infty_{k=n}\big)^{\perp_R} := \Big\{\tilde{u}, \text{ a matrix of linear functionals such that } \Big\langle P^{[1]}_k(x), \tilde{u} \Big\rangle = 0_p : k \geqslant n\Big\},$$

$$Y \cdot \delta \in \Big(\Big\{\big(P^{[2]}_k(x)\big)^\top\Big\}^\infty_{k=n}\Big)^{\perp_L} := \Big\{\tilde{u}, \text{ a matrix of linear functionals such that } \Big\langle \tilde{u}, (P^{[2]}_k(x))^\top \Big\rangle = 0_p : k \geqslant n\Big\}.$$

It is convenient at this point to recall that the topological and algebraic duals of the set of matrix polynomials coincide, $(\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x])' = (\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x])^* = \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[\![x]\!]$, where we understand the set of matrix polynomials or matrix formal series as left or right modules over the ring of matrices. We also recall that the module of matrix polynomials of degree less than or equal to m is a the free module of rank $m+1$. Therefore, for each positive integer m, we consider the linear basis given by the following set of matrices of linear functionals $\{(P^{[1]}_k)^*\}^m_{k=0}$, dual to $\{P^{[1]}_k(x)\}^m_{k=0}$, such that $\Big\langle P^{[1]}_k(x), (P^{[1]}_l)^* \Big\rangle = \delta_{k,l} I_p$, and any linear functional can be written $\sum_{k=0}^{m} (P^{[1]}_l)^* C_k$, where $C_k \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$. Then, $\big(\{P^{[1]}_k(x)\}^\infty_{k=n}\big)^{\perp_R} = \{(P^{[1]}_k)^*\}^{n-1}_{k=0} \mathbb{C}^{p\times p} \cong \big(\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}\big)^n$ and, therefore, is a free right module of rank $m+1$. But, according to (11) and Schwartz kernel theorem, for the set of matrices of linear functionals $\big\{\mathcal{L}_u\big(P^{[2]}_k(y)\big)\big\}^{n-1}_{k=0} \subseteq \big(\{P^{[1]}_k(x)\}^\infty_{k=n}\big)^{\perp_R} = \{(P^{[1]}_k)^*\}^{n-1}_{k=0} \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, and we conclude

$$\big\{\mathcal{L}_u\big(P^{[2]}_k(x)\big)\big\}^{n-1}_{k=0} \mathbb{C}^{p\times p} = \big(\{P^{[1]}_k(x)\}^\infty_{k=n}\big)^{\perp_R}.$$

Thus, we can write $\beta \cdot X = \mathcal{L}_u\big(Q_X(x)\big)$, where $Q_X(x)$ is a matrix polynomial with degree $\deg(Q_X(x)) \leqslant n-1$. A similar argument leads us to write $Y \cdot \delta = \mathcal{L}'_u\big({}_Y Q(x)\big)$, with $\mathcal{L}'_u$ the transpose operator of $\mathcal{L}_u$ –see [110]– and

$Q_Y(x)$ is a matrix polynomial with degree $\deg(Q_Y(x)) \leqslant n-1$. We obviously have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \mathcal{L}_u\big(Q_X(y)\big), P(x)\right\rangle = 0, && \forall P(x) \in \mathrm{Ker}^R(\beta\cdot X) := \{P(x)\in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x] : \langle \beta_X, P(x)\rangle = 0\},\\
&\left\langle P(y), \mathcal{L}'_u\big(Q_Y(x)\big)\right\rangle = 0, && \forall P(y) \in \mathrm{Ker}^L(Y\cdot \delta) := \{P(y)\in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[y] : \langle P(y), Y\cdot\delta\rangle = 0\},
\end{aligned}$$

and Schwartz kernel theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle P(x), Q_X(y)\rangle_u = 0, && \forall P(x) \in \mathrm{Ker}^R(\beta\cdot X),\\
&\langle Q_Y(x), P(y)\rangle_u = 0, && \forall P(y) \in \mathrm{Ker}^L(Y\cdot \delta),
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies

$$Q_X(x) \in \big(\mathrm{Ker}^R(\beta\cdot X)\big))^{\perp^R_u}, \qquad Q_Y(x) \in \big(\mathrm{Ker}^L(Y\cdot\delta)\big))^{\perp^L_u}.$$

Notice that, $\mathrm{Ker}^R_\beta \subset \mathrm{Ker}^R(\beta\cdot X)$ and, consequently, $(\mathrm{Ker}^R_\beta)^{\perp^R_u} \supset (\mathrm{Ker}^R(\beta\cdot X))^{\perp^R_u}$. But we have assumed that $\big(\mathrm{Ker}^R_\beta\big)^{\perp^R_u} = \{0_p\}$, so that $Q_X(x) = 0_p$ and $\beta\cdot X = 0_p$. Consequently, since the set $\big\{\big(\beta^{(a)}_m\big)_x\big\}_{\substack{a=1,\dots,q\\ m=0,\dots,\kappa^{(a)}-1}}$ is linearly independent in the bimodule $\big(\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}[x]\big)'$, we deduce that $X = 0$, which contradicts the initial assumption. Observe that $\mathbb{I}\subset \mathrm{Ker}^L(Y\cdot\delta)$ so that $\big(\mathrm{Ker}^L(Y\cdot\delta)\big)^{\perp^L_u} \subset \mathbb{I}^{\perp^L_u}$. If we assume $\mathbb{I}^{\perp^L_u} = \{0_p\}$ we get $Q_Y(x) = 0_p$ and $Y = 0$, in contradiction with the initial assumption and the matrix is $I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle$. This also implies that $Y = 0$

Hence, the matrix $I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_n}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle$ is nonsingular, allowing us to clean (105) and (106) and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle &= \left\langle P^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle\right)^{-1},\\
\big(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top &= \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle\right)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

These relations, when introduced in (101) and (102), give

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x) &= P^{[1]}_n(x) - \left\langle P^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle\right)^{-1}\mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x),\\
(\hat{P}^{[2]}_n(y))^\top &= (P^{[2]}_n(y))^\top - \langle K_{n-1}(x,y), (\beta)_x\rangle \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle\right)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. To complete the proof notice that, see Proposition 57,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_n &= H_n + \left\langle \hat{P}^{[1]}_n(x), \beta\right\rangle \big(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top\\
&= H_n + \left\langle P^{[1]}_n(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle \left(I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x\right\rangle\right)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{J}_{P^{[2]}_n}\big)^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. **Applications.** We discuss two particular cases of the general additive Uvarov perturbation presented above.

4.3.1. *Total derivatives.* We take the perturbation, which is supported by the diagonal $y = x$, in the following way

$$\nu_{x,x} = \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!}\beta^{(a)}_m \delta^{(m)}(x-x_a), \qquad \beta^{(a)}_m \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}. \tag{107}$$

Proposition 59. *The discrete Hankel mass terms* (107) *are particular cases of* (100) *with*

$$\big(\beta^{(a)}_k\big)_x = \sum_{n=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1-k} (-1)^n \frac{\beta^{(a)}_{k+n}}{(n)!}\delta^{(n)}(x-x_a).$$

To discuss this reduction it is convenient to introduce some further notation.

Definition 47. *For the family of perturbation matrices* $\beta_m^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$*, let consider*

$$\beta^{(a)} := \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0^{(a)} & \beta_1^{(a)} & \beta_2^{(a)} & & & \beta_{\kappa^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} \\ \beta_1^{(a)} & \beta_2^{(a)} & \iddots & & \beta_{\kappa^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} & 0_p \\ \beta_2^{(a)} & \iddots & & \beta_{\kappa^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} & 0_p & 0_p \\ \iddots & & \iddots & & & \\ \beta_{\kappa^{(a)}-1}^{(a)} & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\kappa^{(a)}p\times\kappa^{(a)}p}$$

and if $N := \kappa^{(1)} + \cdots + \kappa^{(q)}$*, then we introduce*

$$\beta = \operatorname{diag}(\beta^{(1)},\dots,\beta^{(q)}) \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np}.$$

We also introduce some additional jets. First a spectral jet with respect to the first variable

$$\mathcal{J}_K^{[1,0]}(y) = \left[K(x_1,y),\dots,\frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,y}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!},\dots,K(x_q,y),\dots,\frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,y}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times Np},$$

and also a double spectral jet of a matrix kernel

$$\mathcal{J}_K = \begin{bmatrix} K(x_1,x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_1}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & K(x_q,x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,x_1}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_1}^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_1}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,x_1}^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_q}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ K(x_1,x_q) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_q}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & K(x_q,x_q) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,x_q}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1,0)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_q}^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_1,x_q}^{(\kappa^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,x_q}^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))_{x_q,x_q}^{(\kappa^{(q)}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \end{bmatrix},$$

which belongs to $\mathbb{C}^{Np\times Np}$*. We have employed the compact notation*

$$(K(x,y))_{a,b}^{(n,m)} = \frac{\partial^{n+m}K}{\partial x^n\partial y^m}\Big|_{x=a,y=b}.$$

Proposition 60. *When the mass term* $\nu_{x,y}$ *is as* (107) *the triviality of kernel subspace* $\operatorname{Ker}_\beta^R = \{0_p\}$ *is ensured whenever* $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R} = \{0_p\}$*. Thus, the quasideterminantal expressions of Theorem 10 hold whenever* $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^L} = \mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R} = \{0_p\}$*. Moreover, if the generalized kernel* $u_{x,y}$ *is of Hankel type, the quasidefiniteness of* u *ensures the trivially of the left and right orthogonal complements of the bilateral ideal* $\mathbb{I}$*.*

Proof. For the diagonal case we choose the mass terms as in Proposition 59

$$\left(\beta_k^{(a)}\right)_x = \sum_{n=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1-k} (-1)^n \frac{\beta_{k+n}^{(a)}}{(n)!}\delta^{(n)}(x-x_a).$$

Then, $\mathbb{I} \subset \operatorname{Ker}_\beta^R$, and, consequently, $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R} \supset \left(\operatorname{Ker}_\beta^R\right)^{\perp_u^R}$. If $u_{x,y}$ is of Hankel type, we have that $P(x) \in \mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R}$ if

$$\left\langle P(x)(x-x_1)^{\kappa^{(1)}}\cdots(x-x_q)^{\kappa^{(q)}}, x^n I_p\right\rangle_u = 0,$$

for $n \in \{0,1,\dots\}$, so that, since u is quasidefinite then $P(x) = 0_p$, and we deduce that $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^R} = \{0_p\}$. A similar argument leads to the triviality $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^L} = \{0_p\}$. □

Proposition 61. *When the mass term $\nu_{x,y}$ is as* (107) *the perturbed matrix orthogonal polynomials and quasitau matrices are*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta \mathcal{J}_K & \beta \mathcal{J}^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x) \\ \mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[1]}} & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$
$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta \mathcal{J}_K & \beta (\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}})^\top \\ \mathcal{J}^{[1,0]}_{K_{n-1}}(y) & (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta \mathcal{J}_K & -\beta (\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2]}})^\top \\ \mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[1]}} & H_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

4.3.2. *Uvarov perturbations with finite discrete support.* We will assume that the matrices of generalized functions $(\beta_m^{(a)})_x$ are supported on a discrete finite set, say $\{\tilde{x}_b\}_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}}$, with multiplicities $\tilde{\kappa}^{(b)}$ such that $\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)} + \cdots + \tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})} = \tilde{N}$, so that

$$(\beta_m^{(a)})_x = \sum_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}} \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{\kappa}^{(b)}-1} \beta_{l,m}^{(b,a)} \frac{(-1)^l}{l!} \delta^{(l)}(x - \tilde{x}_b). \tag{108}$$

The additive perturbation is

$$\nu_{x,y} = \sum_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}} \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{\kappa}^{(b)}-1} \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^{l+m}}{l!m!} \beta_{l,m}^{(b,a)} \delta^{(l)}(x - \tilde{x}_b) \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a), \qquad \beta_{l,m}^{(b,a)} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}.$$

This implies that there is a discrete support of the perturbing matrix of generalized functions, $\operatorname{supp}(\nu_{x,y}) = \{\tilde{x}_b\}_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}} \times \{x_a\}_{a=1}^{q}$. The perturbed sesquilinear form is

$$\langle P(x), Q(y) \rangle_{u+\nu} = \langle P(x), Q(y) \rangle_u + \sum_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}} \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{\kappa}^{(b)}-1} \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{l!m!} \big(P(x)\big)^{(l)}_{\tilde{x}_b} \beta_{l,m}^{(b,a)} \big((Q(y))^\top\big)^{(m)}_{x_a}.$$

Definition 48. *We introduce the following block rectangular matrix of couplings*

$$\beta := \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{1,1}^{(0,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,1}^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,q}^{(0,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,q}^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \beta_{1,1}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,1}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{1,q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \beta_{\tilde{q},1}^{(0,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},1}^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \beta_{\tilde{q},1}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},1}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,0)} & \cdots & \beta_{\tilde{q},q}^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\tilde{N}p \times Np}$$

and, given any matrix of kernels $K(x,y)$*, we introduce the mixed double jet* $\tilde{\jmath}_K \in \mathbb{C}^{Np\times\tilde{N}p}$

$$\tilde{\jmath}_K := \begin{bmatrix} K(\tilde{x}_1,x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,0)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_1}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & K(\tilde{x}_q,x_1) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,0)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_1}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{(K(x,y))^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_1}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_1}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1)!(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(0,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_1}}{(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,\kappa^{(1)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_1}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1)!(\kappa^{(1)}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ K(\tilde{x}_1,x_q) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,0)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_q}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1)!} & \cdots & K(\tilde{x}_q,x_q) & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,0)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_q}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1)!} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{(K(x,y))^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_q}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_1,x_q}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(1)}-1)!(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(0,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_q}}{(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} & \cdots & \frac{(K(x,y))^{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1,\kappa^{(q)}-1)}_{\tilde{x}_q,x_q}}{(\tilde{\kappa}^{(\tilde{q})}-1)!(\kappa^{(q)}-1)!} \end{bmatrix}.$$

With this election we get

Proposition 62. *For* β*'s as in* (108) *we have*

$$\left\langle P_n^{[1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle = \tilde{\jmath}_{P_n^{[1]}}\beta,$$
$$\left\langle \jmath^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle = \tilde{\jmath}_{K_{n-1}}\beta,$$

in terms of the spectral jet $\tilde{\jmath}$ *relative to the set* $\{\tilde{x}_b\}_{b=1}^{\tilde{q}}$*.*

Corollary 4. *Whenever one of the two conditions* $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}^{\perp_u^R} = \{0_p\}$ *or* $\mathbb{I}^{\perp_u^L} = \{0_p\}$ *hold, the matrix* $I_{Np} + \tilde{\jmath}_{K_{n-1}}\beta$ *is nonsingular and the perturbed matrix orthogonal polynomials and quasitau matrices has the following quasideterminantal expressions*

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta\tilde{\jmath}_{K_{n-1}} & \beta\jmath^{[0,1]}_{K_{n-1}}(x) \\ \tilde{\jmath}_{P_n^{[1]}}, & P_n^{[1]}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$
$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2]}(y))^\top = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta\tilde{\jmath}_{K_{n-1}} & \beta\left(\jmath_{P_n^{[2]}}\right)^\top \\ \tilde{\jmath}^{[1,0]}_{K_{n-1}}(y) & (P_n^{[2]}(y))^\top \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\hat{H}_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \beta\tilde{\jmath}_{K_{n-1}} & -\beta(\jmath_{P_n^{[2]}})^\top \\ \tilde{\jmath}_{P_n^{[1]}} & H_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 33 (Discrete Sobolev sesquilinear forms)**.** *If the support lays by the diagonal* $\tilde{x}_a = x_a$ *and* $\tilde{\kappa}^{(a)} = \kappa^{(a)}$ *we have*

$$\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_{u+v} = \langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u + \sum_{a,b=1}^{q}\sum_{m,l=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^{l+m}}{l!m!}\left(P(x)\right)^{(l)}_{x_b}\beta^{(b,a)}_{l,m}\left((Q(y))^\top\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}.$$

This a prototype of discrete Sobolev sesquilinear form. In particular, when $\beta^{(b,a)}_{m.l} = \delta_{a,b}\delta_{l,m}\beta^{(a)}_m$ *and* β *is a blok diagonal matrix we have*

$$\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_{u+v} = \langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_u + \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{l!m!}\left(P(x)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}\beta^{(a)}_m\left((Q(y))^\top\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}.$$

When u *is a Borel measure, we have the discrete Sobolev sesquilinear form*

$$\langle P(x), Q(y)\rangle_{u+v} = \int P(x)\,d\,\mu(x)(Q(x))^\top + \sum_{a=1}^{q}\sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{1}{l!m!}\left(P(x)\right)^{(m)}_{x_a}\beta^{(a)}_m\left((Q(y))^\top\right)^{(m)}_{x_a},$$

for which the Christoffel–Uvarov formulas in Corollary 4 provides biorthogonal families of matrix polynomials as well as its matrix norms*.*

For more on discrete Sobolev orthogonality see [84].

5. Applications to the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice and noncommutative KP hierarchies

The non-Abelian Toda hierarchy can be understood as the theory of continuous transformations of Gram matrices, see for example [12]. We have chosen this simpler scenario, instead of the more general multicomponent one [122, 123, 124, 21, 73, 81], as many of the essential facts regarding integrability are captured within it.

The perturbing parameters are the times of the integrable hierarchy. Given a semi-infinite covector of times $t = \left[t_1, t_2, \ldots\right]$, where we only have a finite number of entries different from zero, and we also consider the semi-infinite matrix $V_0^t := \exp\Big(\sum_{0<j\ll\infty} t_j \Lambda^j\Big)$, and given two time covectors $t_i = \left[t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}, \ldots\right]$, $i \in \{1,2\}$, the perturbed Gram matrix is

$$G^t = V_0^{t_1} G \big(V_0^{t_2}\big)^{-\top},$$

where we have used the notation $t = (t_1, t_2)$ to denote the perturbation parameters. We also consider the polynomials

$$t_1(x) := \sum_{0<j\ll\infty} t_{1,j} x^j, \qquad\qquad t_2(y) := \sum_{0<j\ll\infty} t_{2,j} y^j$$

Then, we can check that

$$\begin{aligned} G^t &= V_0^{t_1} G \big(V_0^{t_2}\big)^{-\top} \\ &= V_0^{t_1} \big\langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\big\rangle_u \big(V_0^{t_2}\big)^{-\top} \\ &= \left\langle e^{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_{1,j} x^j} \chi(x), e^{-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_{2,j} y^j} \chi(y) \right\rangle_u \\ &= \big\langle \chi(x), \chi(y)\big\rangle_{u^t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the deformed bivariate matrix of generalized functions is given by

$$u^t_{x,y} := e^{t_1(x) - t_2(y)}\, u_{x,y}.$$

Observe that if the initial Hankel matrix of generalized kernels $u_{x,y}$, then so is $u^t_{x,y}$. Thus, the Hankel symmetry is preserved under these continuous transformations. In this case, the perturbation is

$$u^t_x := e^{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (t_{1,j} - t_{2,j}) x^j}\, u_x,$$

and we can replace the two familiy of times t_1 and t_2 by just one family, leading to a reduction from the 2D non-Abelian Toda lattice hierarchy to the 1D non-Abelian Toda lattice hierarchy.

We will assume that $u^t_{x,y}$ is quasidefinite; i.e., the Gauss–Borel factorization

$$G^t = (S_1^t)^{-1} H^t (S_2^t)^{-\top} \tag{109}$$

holds. Consequently, for the time-dependent matrix polynomials

$$P^{[1],t}(x) = S_1^t \chi(x), \qquad\qquad P^{[2],t}(y) = S_2^t \chi(y),$$

the biorthogonality conditions hold

$$\Big\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x), P_m^{[2],t}(y)\Big\rangle_{u^t} = \delta_{n,m} H_n^t.$$

We also will need the second kind functions

$$C_n^{[1],t}(z) = \left\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{u^t}, \qquad\qquad \big(C_n^{[2],t}(z)\big)^{\top} = \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, P_n^{[2],t}(y)\right\rangle_{u^t}.$$

Finally, we will also require of the Christoffel–Darboux kernel and its mixed versions

$$K_n^t(x,y) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} (P_k^{[2],t}(y))^{\top} (H_k^t)^{-1} P_k^{[1],t}(x), \qquad K_n^{(pc),t}(x,y) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \big(P_k^{[2],t}(y)\big)^{\top} (H_k^t)^{-1} C_k^{[1],t}(x).$$

In the case of Hankel Gram matrices, they satisfy the Christoffel–Darboux formula.

5.1. **Non Abelian 2D-Toda hierarchy.** Given a semi-infinite matrix A we have unique splitting $A = A_+ + A_-$ where A_+ is an upper triangular block matrix while is A_- a strictly lower triangular block matrix. The Gaussian factorization of the deformed Gram matrix has the following differential consequences

Proposition 63 (Sato–Wilson equations)**.** *The following holds*

$$\frac{\partial S_1}{\partial t_{1,j}}(S_1)^{-1} = -\Big(S_1\Lambda^j(S_1)^{-1}\Big)_-, \qquad \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial t_{2,j}}(S_1)^{-1} = \Big(\tilde S_2(\Lambda^\top)^j(\tilde S_2)^{-1}\Big)_-,$$
$$\frac{\partial \tilde S_2}{\partial t_{1,j}}(\tilde S_2)^{-1} = \Big(S_1\Lambda^j(S_1)^{-1}\Big)_+, \qquad \frac{\partial \tilde S_2}{\partial t_{2,j}}(\tilde S_2)^{-1} = -\Big(\tilde S_2(\Lambda^\top)^j(\tilde S_2)^{-1}\Big)_+.$$

Proof. Taking into account convergence and no associative issues, we look for the derivatives along the deformation parameters in (109)

$$-(S_1^t)^{-1}\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}}(S_1^t)^{-1}\tilde S_2^t + (S_1^t)^{-1}\frac{\partial \tilde S_2^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} = \Lambda^j G^t$$
$$= \Lambda^j(S_1^t)^{-1}\tilde S_2^t, \tag{110}$$
$$-(S_1^t)^{-1}\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}}(S_1^t)^{-1}\tilde S_2^t + (S_1^t)^{-1}\frac{\partial \tilde S_2^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} = -G^t(\Lambda^j)^\top$$
$$= (S_1^t)^{-1}\tilde S_2^t(\Lambda^j)^\top, \tag{111}$$

so that

$$-\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}}(S_1^t)^{-1} + \frac{\partial \tilde S_2^t}{\partial t_{1,j}}\big(\tilde S_2^t\big)^{-1} = S_1^t\Lambda^j(S_1^t)^{-1},$$
$$-\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}}(S_1^t)^{-1} + \frac{\partial \tilde S_2^t}{\partial t_{2,j}}\big(\tilde S_2^t\big)^{-1} = -\tilde S_2^t(\Lambda^j)^\top\big(\tilde S_2^t\big)^{-1},$$

and the result follows. □

Proposition 64 (Non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice equations)**.** *Using the notation* $t_{1,1} = \eta$ *and* $t_{2,1} = \zeta$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta}\Big(\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial\eta}(H_k)^{-1}\Big) + H_{k+1}(H_k)^{-1} - H_k(H_{k-1})^{-1} = 0, \tag{112}$$

For the Hankel case we find a reduction the non-Abelian 1D Toda lattice equation, where $\eta = \zeta$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\Big(\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial\eta}(H_k)^{-1}\Big) + H_{k+1}(H_k)^{-1} - H_k(H_{k-1})^{-1} = 0.$$

Proof. From Proposition 63 we get

$$\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial\eta}(H_k)^{-1} = U_k - U_{k+1}, \qquad k\in\{0,1,\dots\},$$
$$\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\zeta} = H_k(H_{k-1})^{-1}, \qquad k\in\{1,2,\dots\}$$

where $U_0 = 0_p$ and $U_k := (S_1^t)_{k,k-1}\in\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$, $k\in\{1,2,\dots\}$. □

The non-Abelian Toda lattice was introduced in the context of string theory by Polyakov, [100, 101], and then studied under the inverse spectral transform by Mikhailov [91] and Riemann surface theory by Krichever [77]. The Darboux transformations were considered in [106] and later in [98]. We refer the reader to [12] for a deeper treatment on these issues.

These equations are just the first members of an infinite set of nonlinear partial differential equations, an integrable hierarchy. Its elements are given by

Definition 49. *The Lax and Zakharov–Shabat matrices are given by*

$$L_1 := S_1\Lambda(S_1)^{-1}, \qquad L_2 := \tilde S_2(\Lambda)^\top(\tilde S_2)^{-1},$$
$$B_{1,j} := \big((L_1)^j\big)_+, \qquad B_{2,j} := \big((L_2)^j\big)_-.$$

Proposition 65 (The zero-curvature formulation of the integrable hierarchy)**.** *The Lax matrices are subject to the following* Lax equations

$$\frac{\partial L_i}{\partial t_{j,k}} = \left[B_{j,k}, L_i\right],$$

and Zakharov–Shabat matrices fulfill the following Zakharov–Shabat equations

$$\frac{\partial B_{i',k'}}{\partial t_{i,k}} - \frac{\partial B_{i,k}}{\partial t_{i',k'}} + \left[B_{i,k}, B_{i',k'}\right] = 0.$$

Using the notation

$$a_k := H_k (H_{k-1})^{-1}, \qquad b_k := U_k - U_{k+1},$$

for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = -(S_1)_{1,0}$. The Gauss–Borel factorization problem implies

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial \zeta} = a_k - a_{k+1},$$
$$\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial \eta} = b_k H_k,$$

from where (112) follows. This system is equivalent to the following nonlinear system of first order PDE

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial \zeta} = a_k - a_{k+1},$$
$$\frac{\partial a_k}{\partial \eta} = b_k a_k - a_k b_{k-1}. \tag{113}$$

5.2. **Baker functions.**

Definition 50. *We consider the wave matrices*

$$W_1^t := S_1^t V_0^{t_1}, \qquad \tilde{W}_2^t := \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} V_0^{-t_2} = (H^t)^{-\top} S_2^t V_0^{-t_2} \tag{114}$$

where $\tilde{S}_2^t := H^t \left(S_2^t\right)^{-\top}$.

Proposition 66 (Zakharov–Shabat equations)**.** *The wave matrices satisfy the linear systems*

$$\frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} = B_{1,j} W_1^t, \qquad \frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} = B_{2,j} W_1^t, \qquad \frac{\partial \tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} = -\left(B_{1,j}\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t, \qquad \frac{\partial \tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} = -\left(B_{2,j}\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t.$$

Proof. It is deduced as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} =& \frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} V_0^{t_1} + S_1^t \Lambda^j V_0^{t_1} = \left(\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} (S_1^t)^{-1} + (L_1)^j\right) W_1^{t_1} \\
=& B_{1,j} W_1^t, \\
\frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} =& \frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} V_0^{t_1} = \left(\frac{\partial S_1^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} (S_1^t)^{-1}\right) W_1^{t_1} \\
=& B_{2,j} W_1^t, \\
\frac{\partial \tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} =& \frac{\partial \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top}}{\partial t_{1,j}} V_0^{-t_2} = -\left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} \frac{\partial \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^\top}{\partial t_{1,j}} \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} V_0^{-t_2} = -\left(\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_2^t}{\partial t_{1,j}} \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-1}\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t \\
=& -\left(B_{1,j}\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t, \\
\frac{\partial \tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} =& \frac{\partial \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top}}{\partial t_{2,j}} V_0^{-t_2} - \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} \Lambda^j V_0^{-t_2} = -\left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} \frac{\partial \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^\top}{\partial t_{2,j}} \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} V_0^{-t_2} - \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-\top} \Lambda^j V_0^{-t_2} \\
=& -\left(\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_2^t}{\partial t_{2,j}} \left(\tilde{S}_2^t\right)^{-1} + (L_2)^j\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t \\
=& -\left(B_{2,j}\right)^\top \tilde{W}_2^t.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The wave matrices satisfy $I = W_1^t G(\tilde{W}_2^t)^\top$. Notice that we can formally write $W_2^t := (\tilde{W}_2^t)^{-\top} = \tilde{S}_2^t\big(V_0^{t_2}\big)^{-\top}$, which could happen to not exist as a product.

Definition 51. *The Baker functions are given by*

$$\Psi_1(t,z) := W_1^t\chi(z), \qquad \Psi_2^*(t,z) := \tilde{W}_2^t\chi(z),$$
$$\big(\Psi_1^*(t,z)\big)^\top := \big(\chi^*(z)\big)^\top G(\tilde{W}_2^t)^\top, \qquad \Psi_2(t,z) := W_1^t G\chi^*(z),$$

We will promptly show that the second pair of Baker functions do have a proper meaning as Cauchy transforms.

Remark 34. *Normally, in the literature on integrable systems they are formally written as follows*

$$\Psi_1(t,z) := W_1^t\chi(z), \qquad \Psi_2^*(t,z) := (W_2^t)^{-\top}\chi(z),$$
$$\Psi_1^*(t,z) := (W_1^t)^{-\top}\chi^*(z), \qquad \Psi_2(t,z) := W_2^t\chi^*(z).$$

Extending from a Gram type definition to a Cauchy type, as we did with the second kind functions.

Proposition 67. *The Baker functions and the biorthogonal polynomials are connected as follows*

$$\Psi_1(t,z) = e^{t_1(z)}\,P^{[1],t}(z),$$
$$\Psi_2^*(t,z) := e^{-t_2(z)}(H^t)^{-\top}P^{[2],t}(z),$$
$$\big(\Psi_1^*(t,z)\big)^\top := \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, e^{-t_2(y)}\,P^{[2],t}(y)\right\rangle_u (H^t)^{-1} \qquad z\notin \mathrm{supp}_x(u),$$
$$\Psi_2(t,z) = \left\langle e^{t_1(x)}\,P^{[1],t}(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_u, \qquad z\notin \mathrm{supp}_y(u),$$

where r_x and r_y where introduced in Definition 23.

Proof. The first two relations follow immediately, while for the second two we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\Psi_1^*(t,z)\big)^\top &:= \big(\chi^*(z)\big)^\top\langle\chi(x),\chi(y)\rangle_u(\tilde{W}_2^t)^\top\\ &= \left\langle\big(\chi^*(z)\big)^\top\chi(x), \tilde{W}_2^t\chi(y)\right\rangle_u\\ &= \left\langle\frac{I_p}{z-x},\Psi_2^*(t,z)\right\rangle_u, \qquad z\notin\mathrm{supp}_x(u),\\ \Psi_2(t,z) &:= W_1^t\langle\chi(x),\chi(y)\rangle_u\chi^*(z)\\ &= \left\langle W_1^t\chi(x), \big(\chi^*(z)\big)^\top\chi(y)\right\rangle_u\\ &= \left\langle\Psi_1(x,t),\frac{I_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_u, \qquad z\notin\mathrm{supp}_y(u).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 68 (Zakharov–Shabat equations)**.** *The Baker functions satisfy the linear systems*

$$\frac{\partial\Psi_1}{\partial t_{1,j}} = B_{1,j}\Psi_1, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_1}{\partial t_{2,j}} = B_{2,j}\Psi_1, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2^*}{\partial t_{1,j}} = -(B_{1,j})^\top\Psi_2^*, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2^*}{\partial t_{2,j}} = -(B_{2,j})^\top\Psi_2^*,$$
$$\frac{\partial\big(\Psi_1^*\big)^\top}{\partial t_{1,j}} = -\big(\Psi_1^*\big)^\top B_{1,j}, \qquad \frac{\partial\big(\Psi_1^*\big)^\top}{\partial t_{2,j}} = -\big(\Psi_1^*\big)^\top B_{2,j}, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2}{\partial t_{1,j}} = (B_{1,j})^\top\Psi_2, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2}{\partial t_{2,j}} = (B_{2,j})^\top\Psi_2.$$

Proof. From Definition 51 we get

$$\frac{\partial\Psi_1}{\partial t_{i,j}} := \frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{i,j}}\chi(z), \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2^*}{\partial t_{i,j}} := \frac{\partial\tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{i,j}}\chi(z),$$
$$\frac{\partial\big(\Psi_1^*(t,z)\big)^\top}{\partial t_{i,j}} := \big(\chi^*(z)\big)^\top G\Big(\frac{\partial\tilde{W}_2^t}{\partial t_{i,j}}\Big)^\top, \qquad \frac{\partial\Psi_2}{\partial t_{i,j}} := \frac{\partial W_1^t}{\partial t_{i,j}}G\chi^*(z),$$

and using Proposition 66 we obtain the stated result. □

For the first flows and the corresponding matrices $B_\eta := B_{1,1} = (L_1)_+$ and $B_\zeta := B_{2,1} = (L_2)_-$ we have the following expressions

$$B_\eta = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 & I_p & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ 0_p & b_1 & I_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ 0_p & 0_p & b_2 & I_p & 0_p & \\ 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & b_3 & I_p & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \qquad B_\zeta = \begin{bmatrix} 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ a_1 & 0_p & 0_p & 0_p & \dots \\ 0_p & a_2 & 0_p & 0_p & \\ 0_p & 0_p & a_3 & 0_p & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we have the Zakharov–Shabat linear system

$$\frac{\partial \Psi_{1,k}}{\partial \zeta} = a_k \Psi_{1,k-1},$$
$$\frac{\partial \Psi_{1,k}}{\partial \eta} = b_k \Psi_{1,k} + \Psi_{1,k+1},$$

whose compatibility is (113).

The reader must be aware that despite the Baker functions $\Psi_1(t,z)$ and $\Psi_2^*(t,z)$ are, as Proposition 67 tell us, essentially the biorthogonal polynomials $P^{[1],t}(z)$ and $P^{[2],t}(z)$, it is just not the same for the other two Baker functions, $(\Psi^*)^\top(t,z)$ and $\Psi_2(z,t)$, as they are not the second kind functions, see (10). Indeed, these Baker functions are

$$\Psi_2(t,z) = \left\langle P^{[1],t}(x)\, e^{t_1(x)}, \frac{I_p}{z-y} \right\rangle_u, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_y(u),$$
$$\left(\Psi_1^*(t,z)\right)^\top := \left\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}(y) \right\rangle_u (H^t)^{-1}, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_x(u),$$

while, according to Proposition 28, for a matrix of generalized kernels $u^t_{x,y} \in \left((\mathcal{O}'_c)_{x,y}\right)^{p\times p}$, the second kind functions are

$$C_n^{[1],t}(z) = \left\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x)\, e^{t_1(x)}, \frac{I_p\, e^{-t_2(y)}}{z-y} \right\rangle_u, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_y(u),$$
$$\left(C_n^{[2],t}(z)\right)^\top = \left\langle \frac{I_p\, e^{t_1(x)}}{z-x}, e^{-t_2(y)}\, P_n^{[2],t}(y) \right\rangle_u^t, \qquad z \notin \operatorname{supp}_x(u).$$

We see that only for particular situations they can be identified. For example, whenever $t_2 = 0$ we find $C_n^{[1],t}(z) = \Psi_2(t,z)$. Notice that, as we immediately will explain, this corresponds to the noncommutative KP flows. This issue will reappear with the bilinear identities discussed below.

5.3. **Noncommutative KP hierarchy.** We will show how the noncommutative KP hierarchy appears within the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattce hierarchy. For that aim we put all the times $t_{2,j} = 0$ and consider only continuous deformations given by the times $t_{1,j}$, $j \in \{1,2,\dots\}$, and the first three times will be denoted by $\eta := t_{1,1}$, $\rho := t_{1,2}$ and $\theta := t_{1,3}$, $U_k := (S_1)_{k,k-1}$, $k \in \{1,2\dots\}$, will denote the blocks on the first subdiagonal of S_1^t, the corresponding matrix will be denoted by U.

Definition 52. *Given two semi-infinite matrices $Z_1(t)$ and $Z_2(t)$ we say that*

- $Z_1(t) \in \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}$ *if* $Z_1(t)\left(V_0^{t_1}\right)^{-1}$ *is a block strictly lower triangular matrix.*
- $Z_2(t) \in \mathfrak{u}$ *if* $Z_2(t)$ *is a block upper triangular matrix.*

Then, we can state the following

Proposition 69. *Given two semi-infinite matrices $Z_1(t)$ and $Z_2(t)$ such that*

- $Z_1(t) \in \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}$,
- $Z_2(t) \in \mathfrak{u}$,
- $Z_1(t)G = Z_2(t)$,

then $Z_1(t) = Z_2(t) = 0$.

Proof. Observe that

$$Z_1(t)\big(V_0^{t_1}\big)^{-1}\big(S_1(t)\big)^{-1} = Z_2(t)\big(\tilde{S}_2(t)\big)^{-1},$$

and, as in the LHS we have a strictly lower triangular block semi-infinite matrix while in the RHS we have an upper triangular block semi-infinite matrix, both sides must vanish and the result follows. □

Definition 53. *When* $A - B \in \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}$ *we write* $A = B + \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}$ *and if* $A - B \in \mathfrak{u}$ *we write* $A = B + \mathfrak{u}$.

Proposition 70 (Second and third order linear ODE)**.** *Among others the Baker function* Ψ_1 *satisfies the following linear differential equations*

$$\frac{\partial(\Psi_1)_k}{\partial\rho} = \frac{\partial^2(\Psi_1)_k}{\partial\eta^2} - 2\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\eta}(\Psi_1)_k, \tag{115}$$

$$\frac{\partial(\Psi_1)_k}{\partial\theta} = \frac{\partial^3(\Psi_1)_k}{\partial\eta^3} - 3\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\eta}\frac{\partial(\Psi_1)_k}{\partial\eta} - \frac{3}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial^2 U_k}{\partial\eta^2} + \frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\rho}\Big)(\Psi_1)_k, \tag{116}$$

Proof. We only check the first relation, the second despite being more complicated it follows from the same principles. In the one hand,

$$\frac{\partial W_1}{\partial\rho} = \Big(\frac{\partial S_1}{\partial\rho} + S_1\Lambda^2\Big)V_0^{t_1}$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 W_1}{\partial\eta^2} = \Big(\frac{\partial^2 S_1}{\partial\eta^2} + 2\frac{\partial S_1}{\partial\eta}\Lambda + S_1\Lambda^2\Big)V_0^{t_1}$$

so that

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\eta^2}\right)(W_1) = -2\left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial\eta}\Lambda\right)V_0^{t_1} + \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}$$

and, consequently,

$$Z_1 := \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\eta^2} + 2\frac{\partial U}{\partial\eta}\Lambda\right)(W_1) \in \mathfrak{l}V_0^{t_1}.$$

On the other hand,

$$Z_2 := \frac{\partial\tilde{S}_2}{\partial\rho} - \frac{\partial^2\tilde{S}_2}{\partial\eta^2} + 2\frac{\partial U}{\partial\eta}\Lambda\tilde{S}_2 \in \mathfrak{u}.$$

Now, we apply Proposition 69 to get the result. □

Remark 35 (Noncommutative KP equation)**.** *The compatibility of both equations leads to*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\Big(4\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\theta} + 6\Big(\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\eta}\Big)^2 - \frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\eta^3}\Big) - \frac{\partial^2 U_k}{\partial\rho^2} + 6\left[\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\eta}, \frac{\partial U_k}{\partial\rho}\right] = 0. \tag{117}$$

This matrix noncommutative KP equations has been considered for the first time in [20] and its relation with the matrix heat hierarchy, the Hopf–Cole transformation and the construction of solutions was discussed in [68]. In [78] we can find an excellent treatment on the subject, see also [127]. Recently, in [59] a discussion of solutions derived from the Darboux transformation technique is given, for further studies on its solutions see [109, 117]. Notice, that the standard notation in the literature for the independent variables is x, y and t, as we have already used x, y we decided to introduce the alternative notation η, ρ and θ for the independent variables.

Remark 36. *Notice that the linear systems for the Baker function as well as the noncommutative KP equation involve a single position in the lattice as the equations are for* U_k*, with* k *fixed.*

5.4. **Transformation theory.** We now proceed to the study of how the previous Geronimus–Uvarov transformations (we recover Geronimus for $W_C(x) = I_p$) affect the solutions of the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice and the noncommutative KP hierarchies. That is, the interplay between the continuous Toda type perturbations and the discrete rational deformations dictated by the Geronimus–Uvarov transformations. It is important to notice that $[\Lambda, V_0^t] = 0$, to realize that both transformations, continuous flows of Toda type and Geronimus–Uvarov transformations, commute. That is, given a Geronimus–Uvarov transformation

$$\hat{u}_{x,y} W_G(y) = W_C(x) u_{x,y}, \qquad \hat{G} W_G(\Lambda^\top) = W_C(\Lambda) G,$$

we will have the corresponding t-evolved equations

$$\hat{u}^t_{x,y} W_G(y) = W_C(x) u^t_{x,y}, \qquad \hat{G}^t W_G(\Lambda^\top) = W_C(\Lambda) G^t,$$

where

$$\hat{u}^t_{x,y} = e^{t_1(x) - t_2(y)}\, \hat{u}_{x,y}, \qquad \hat{G}^t = V_0^{t_1} \hat{G} \left(V_0^{t_2}\right)^{-\top}.$$

Therefore, all previous results hold true. For example, Theorem 6 gives , when $n \geqslant N_G$, with Hankel spectral massses as described in (68), the following Christoffel–Geronimus–Uvarov type formulas,

$$\hat{P}^{[1],t}_n(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1]}_{n+N_C}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}^t_n = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & H^t_{n-N_G} \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\left(\hat{P}^{[2],t}_n(y)\right)^\top = -\Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & H^t_{n-N_G} \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n-N_G+1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C-1}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C^{[1],t}_{n+N_C-1}} - \left\langle P^{[1],t}_{n+N_C-1}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \\ W_G(y)\mathcal{J}_{C,K^t_{n-1}}(y) & W_G(y)\left(\mathcal{J}_{G,K^{(pc),t}_{n-1}}(y) - \left\langle K^t_{n-1}(x,y), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G\right) + \mathcal{J}_{G,\nu}(y) & 0_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, $\hat{H}^t_n$ is a new solution of the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice equation (112) constructed in terms of the original solution H^t_n and the time dependent spectral jets, corresponding to both perturbing matrix polynomials, of $P^{[1],t}(x)$ and $C^{[1],t}(x)$.

Uvarov transformations can be applied similarly. In particular, Theorem 10 yields, whenever $\left(\mathrm{Ker}_{\beta}^{R}\right)^{\perp_R^{u^t}} = \left(\mathrm{Ker}_{\beta}^{L}\right)^{\perp_L^{u^t}} = \{0_p\}$, the perturbed matrix orthogonal polynomials and quasitau matrices

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1],t}(x) = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^t}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^t}^{[0,1]}(x) \\ \left\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & P_n^{[1],t}(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(\hat{P}_n^{[2],t}(y))^{\top} = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^t}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & \left(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2],t}}\right)^{\top} \\ \left\langle K_{n-1}^t(x,z), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & (P_n^{[2],t}(y))^{\top} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{H}_n^t = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^t}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & -\beta(\mathcal{J}_{P_n^{[2],t}})^{\top} \\ \left\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & H_n^t \end{bmatrix}.$$

5.4.1. *Application to the noncommutative KP hierarchy.* We have seen is §5.3 how the noncommutative KP flows appear once we put $t_2(y) = 0$. For the noncommutative KP flows the first subdiagonal coefficients U_k of S_1 play a key role, as the hierarchy and the equations, see the noncommutative KP equation (117), are expressed in terms of them. Let us recall that the U_k's is the coefficient multiplying the term x^{n-1} in the polynomial $P_k^{[1],t}(z)$. Thus, it is of interest to have quasideterminantal expressions for the transformations of the U. From (78) we get

$$\hat{U}_n = U_{n+N_C} - A_{C,N_C-1} + \omega_{n,n+N_C-1}. \tag{118}$$

Now, we recall Proposition 50, so that for $n \geqslant N_G$, we have

$$\omega_{n,n+N_C-1} =$$

$$-\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}}, \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n-N_G}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1]}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0_p \\ \vdots \\ 0_p \\ I_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

and we find the quasideterminantal expression

$$\hat{U}_n^t = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n-N_G}^{[1],t}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n-N_G}^{[1],t}} - \left\langle P_{n-N_G}^{[1],t}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-2}^{[1],t}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-2}^{[1],t}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-2}^{[1],t}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & 0_p \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C-2}^{[1],t}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C-1}^{[1],t}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C-1}^{[1],t}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & I_p \\ \mathcal{J}_{C,P_{n+N_C}^{[1],t}} & \mathcal{J}_{G,C_{n+N_C}^{[1],t}} - \left\langle P_{n+N_C}^{[1],t}(x), (\xi)_x \right\rangle \mathcal{W}_G & U_n^t - A_{C,N_C-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the Uvarov transformations we can also find quasideterminantal expressions for the transformed U's. Just looking at the corresponding power in x^{n-1}, from Theorem 10, whenever $\left(\mathrm{Ker}_{\beta}^{R}\right)^{\perp_R^{u^t}} = \left(\mathrm{Ker}_{\beta}^{L}\right)^{\perp_L^{u^t}} = \{0_p\}$, we get

$$\hat{U}_n^t = \Theta_* \begin{bmatrix} I_{Np} + \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{K_{n-1}^t}^{[0,1]}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & \left(\mathcal{J}_{P_{n-1}^{[2],t}}\right)^{\top} (H_{n-1}^t)^{-1} \\ \left\langle P_n^{[1],t}(x), (\beta)_x \right\rangle & U_n^t \end{bmatrix}.$$

5.5. **Christoffel and Geronimus transformations, Miwa shifts, τ-type matrix functions and Sato formulas.** We consider some interesting expressions of the biorthogonal polynomials and its second kind functions in terms of the matrix norms and its Christoffel and Geronimus transformations for monic matrix polynomials of degree one.

Remark 37. *We will use the following ordered products* $\prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowleft n} A_m := A_n A_{n-1} \cdots A_0$ *and* $\prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowright n} A_m := A_0 A_1 \cdots A_n$*, for its use in integrable systems theory see, for example,* [50].

Proposition 71. *For a Christoffel transformations with* $W_C(x) = I_p x - A$ *we have*

$$P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A) = (-1)^{n+1} \prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowleft n} \hat{H}_m (H_m)^{-1}, \qquad \hat{C}_n^{[2]}(A^\top) = (-1)^{n-1} (H_n)^\top \prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowleft n-1} (\hat{H}_m)^{-\top} (H_m)^\top.$$

Proof. Degree one Christoffel transformation [12], fit in the discussion of §3 when $W_G(x) = I_p$ and $W_C(x) = I_p x - A$. From the connection formula

$$\hat{P}_n^{[1]}(x)(I_p x - A) = P_{n+1}^{[1]}(x) + \omega_{n,n} P_n^{[1]}(x), \qquad \omega_{n,n} = \hat{H}_n (H_n)^{-1},$$

recalling (77) for $N_G = 0$ and $N_C = 1$, and also the form of the spectral jets, see the discussion in §3 we get

$$P_{n+1}^{[1]}(A) = -\hat{H}_n (H_n)^{-1} P_n^{[1]}(A),$$

from where the first relation follows.

For the second relation, we first observe that (65) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\hat{C}_0^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_0)^{-1} &= (I_p x - A)\big(C_0^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_0)^{-1} - I_p, \\ \big(\hat{C}_{n-1}^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-1} + \big(\hat{C}_n^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_n)^{-1} &= (I_p x - A)\big(C_n^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_n)^{-1}, \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_0^{[2]}(x) &= C_0^{[2]}(x)(I_p x - A^\top) - (H_0)^\top, \\ (\hat{H}_{k-1})^{-\top} \hat{C}_{k-1}^{[2]}(x) + (H_k)^{-\top} \hat{C}_k^{[2]}(x) &= (H_k)^{-\top} C_k^{[2]}(x)(I_p x - A^\top), \qquad k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_0^{[2]}(A^\top) &= -(H_0)^\top, \\ \hat{C}_n^{[2]}(A^\top) &= -(H_n)^\top (\hat{H}_{n-1})^{-\top} \hat{C}_{n-1}^{[2]}(A^\top), \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly,

Proposition 72. *Given a Geronimus transformation with* $W_G(x) = I_p x - A$ *we have*

$$C_n^{[1]}(A) = (-1)^{n-1} \check{H}_n \prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowleft n-1} (H_m)^{-1} \check{H}_m, \qquad \check{P}_{n+1}^{[2]}(A^\top) = (-1)^{n+1} \prod_{m=0}^{\curvearrowleft n} (H_m)^\top (\check{H}_m)^{-\top}.$$

Proof. For a Geronimus transformation with $W_G(x) = I_p x - A$ and $W_C(x) = I_p$ we deduce, see (26) and (43),

$$\begin{aligned} \check{C}_0^{[1]}(x)(I_p x - A) &= C_0^{[1]}(x) + \check{H}_0, \\ \check{C}_n^{[1]}(x)(I_p x - A) &= C_n^{[1]}(x) + \omega_{n,n-1} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(x), \qquad \omega_{n,n-1} = \check{H}_n (H_{n-1})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, discussion in §3 implies

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^{[1]}(A) &= -\check{H}_0, \\ C_n^{[1]}(A) &= -\check{H}_n (H_{n-1})^{-1} C_{n-1}^{[1]}(A), \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

From (24) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} (I_p x - A)\big(P_n^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_n)^{-1} &= \big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-1} + \big(\check{P}_{n+1}^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (\check{H}_{n+1})^{-1} \omega_{n+1,n} \\ &= \big(\check{P}_n^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-1} + \big(\check{P}_{n+1}^{[2]}(x)\big)^\top (H_n)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we get

$$(H_n)^{-\top} P_n^{[2]}(x)(I_p x - A^\top) = (\check{H}_n)^{-\top} \check{P}_n^{[2]}(x) + (H_n)^{-\top} \check{P}_{n+1}^{[2]}(x),$$

and again we are lead, see §3, to

$$\check{P}_{n+1}^{[2]}(A^\top) = -(H_n)^\top (\check{H}_n)^{-\top} \check{P}_n^{[2]}(A^\top).$$

□

Definition 54 (Miwa shifts)**.** *We consider the following coherent time shift*

$$[z] := \left[\frac{1}{z}, \frac{1}{2z^2}, \frac{1}{3z^3}, \dots\right]. \tag{119}$$

Remark 38. *The relevance of this Miwa shift comes from the Taylor expansion of the logarithm*

$$\begin{aligned}[z](x) &= \frac{x}{z} + \frac{x^2}{2z^2} + \frac{x^3}{3z^3} + \cdots \\ &= -\log\left(1 - \frac{x}{z}\right), \qquad |x| < |z|,\end{aligned}$$

so that $e^{t_1(x) - [z]_1(x)} = \left(1 - \frac{x}{z}\right) e^{t_1(x)}$, $|x| < |z|$, *and* $e^{-(t_2(y) - [z]_2(y))} = \left(1 - \frac{y}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-t_2(y)}$, $|y| < |z|$. *The shifts are going to be taken inside the sesquilinear form. Consequently, for the Miwa shift* $[z]_1$ *we request* $|z| > r_x$ *and for* $[z]_2$ *that* $|z| > r_y$, *ensuring in this way the convergence of the series of the logarithm.*

We see that for the scalar case the composition of these Miwa shifts can generate any massless Geronimus–Uvarov transformation. However, for the matrix case, the Miwa shifts just introduced are more limited, as they are scalar shifts, the matrix A is a multiple of the identity I_p. This is due, in part, to the simplification of considering the non-Abelian Toda flows instead of the multicomponent flows. However, in that more general scenario, the times are not any more scalar, but diagonal matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ and, consequently, the corresponding composition of partial Miwa shifts will achieve utmost diagonal massless Geronimus–Uvarov transformations.

Definition 55 (τ-ratio matrices)**.** *We introduce the matrices*

$$\tau_n^{(1)}(t, s) := \prod_{m=0}^{\widehat{n}} H_m^t (H_m^s)^{-1}, \qquad \tau_n^{(2)}(t, s) := \prod_{m=0}^{\widehat{n}} (H_m^t)^{-1} H_m^s.$$

Remark 39. *Observe that*

$$(\tau_n^{(1)}(s, t))^{-1} = \prod_{m=0}^{\widehat{n}} H_m^t (H_m^s)^{-1}, \qquad (\tau_n^{(2)}(s, t))^{-1} = \prod_{m=0}^{\widehat{n}} (H_m^t)^{-1} H_m^s.$$

Remark 40 (Why τ-ratio?)**.** *Notice that in the scalar case,* $p = 1$, *we have, in terms of the the* τ*-function* $\tau_n(t) = \prod_{m=0}^{n} H_m^t$,

$$\tau_n^{(1)}(t, s) = \frac{\tau_n(t)}{\tau_n(s)}, \qquad \tau_n^{(2)}(t, s) = \frac{\tau_n(s)}{\tau_n(t)}.$$

Thus, in the scalar case the τ*-ratio matrices are just the ratio of* τ *functions.*

Theorem 11 (Sato formulas)**.** *In terms of* τ*-ratio matrices and Miwa shifts we have the following expressions for the biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its second kind functions*

$$\begin{aligned} P_n^{[1],t}(z) &= z^{-n} \tau_{n-1}^{(1)}(t - [z]_1, t), & \left(C_n^{[2],t}(z)\right)^\top (H_n^t)^{-1} &= z^{n-1} \left(\tau_n^{(1)}(t, t + [z]_1)\right)^{-1}, & |z| > r_x \\ (H_n^t)^{-1} C_n^{[1],t}(z) &= z^{n+1} \tau_n^{(2)}(t, t - [z]_2), & \left(P_n^{[2],t}(z)\right)^\top &= z^{-n} \left(\tau_{n-1}^{(2)}(t + [z]_2, t)\right)^{-1}, & |z| > r_y. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If we write $1 - \frac{x}{z} = -\frac{1}{z}\Big(x - z\Big)$, we can understand the Miwa shifts $t - [z]_1$ $(t - [z]_2)$ as a degree one Christoffel (Geronimus) transformations of the generalized kernel $u_{x,y}^t$. For the Gram matrices we have $G^{t-[z]_1} = -z^{-1}\hat{G}$ and $G^{t-[z]_2} = -z\check{G}$, where $\hat{G}$ and $\check{G}$ denote the corresponding scalar Christoffel and massless Geronimus

transformations with monic perturbing polynomials $I_p(x-z)$ and $I_p(y-z)^{-1}$ and $\hat{u}^t_{x,y} = (x-z)u^t_{x,y}$ and $\check{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y}(y-z)^{-1}$, respectively. Thus, the uniqueness of the Gauss–Borel factorization gives

$$S_1^{t-[z]_1} = \hat{S}_1^t, \qquad H^{t-[z]_1} = -z^{-1}\hat{H}^t, \qquad S_2^{t-[z]_1} = \hat{S}_2^t,$$
$$S_1^{t-[z]_2} = \check{S}_1^t, \qquad H^{t-[z]_2} = -z\check{H}^t, \qquad S_2^{t-[z]_2} = \check{S}_2^t.$$

Therefore, according to Definition 20 we get for $|z| > r_x$

$$P^{[1],t-[z]_1}(x) = \hat{P}^{[1],t}(x), \quad P^{[2],t-[z]_1}(y) = \hat{P}^{[2],t}(y), \quad C^{[1],t-[z]_1}(x) = -z^{-1}\hat{C}^{[1],t}(x), \quad C^{[2],t-[z]_1}(y) = -z^{-1}\hat{C}^{[2],t}(y),$$

and for $|z| > r_y$ we obtain that

$$P^{[1],t-[z]_2}(x) = \check{P}^{[1],t}(x), \quad P^{[2],t-[z]_2}(y) = \check{P}^{[2],t}(y), \quad C^{[1],t-[z]_2}(x) = -z\check{C}^{[1],t}(x), \quad C^{[2],t-[z]_2}(y) = -z\check{C}^{[2],t}(y).$$

Then, Propositions 71 and 72, with $A = I_p z$, give

$$P^{[1],t}_{n+1}(z) = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} H_m^{t-[z]_1}(H_m^t)^{-1}, \qquad C^{[2],t-[z]_1}_n(z) = z^{n-1}(H_n^t)^\top \prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n-1}} (H_m^{t-[z]_1})^{-\top}(H_m^t)^\top,$$
$$C^{[1],t}_n(z) = z^{n+1}H_n^{t-[z]_2}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n-1}} (H_m^t)^{-1}H_m^{t-[z]_2}, \qquad P^{[2],t-[z]_2}_{n+1}(z) = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} (H_m^t)^\top (H_m^{t-[z]_2})^{-\top},$$

so that, Miwa shifting some times we have

$$P^{[1],t}_{n+1}(z) = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} H_m^{t-[z]_1}(H_m^t)^{-1}, \qquad C^{[2],t}_n(z) = z^{n-1}(H_n^{t+[z]_1})^\top \prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n-1}} (H_m^t)^{-\top}(H_m^{t+[z]_1})^\top, \quad |z| > r_x,$$
$$C^{[1],t}_n(z) = z^{n+1}H_n^{t-[z]_2}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n-1}} (H_m^t)^{-1}H_m^{t-[z]_2}, \quad P^{[2],t}_{n+1}(z) = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} (H_m^{t+[z]_2})^\top (H_m^t)^{-\top}, \qquad |z| > r_y.$$

and a transposition gives

$$P^{[1],t}_{n+1}(z) = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} H_m^{t-[z]_1}(H_m^t)^{-1}, \quad \left(C^{[2],t}_n(z)\right)^\top (H_n^t)^{-1} = z^{n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\curvearrowright}{n}} H_m^{t+[z]_1}(H_m^t)^{-1}, \qquad |z| > r_x,$$
$$(H_n^t)^{-1}C^{[1],t}_n(z) = z^{n+1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} (H_m^t)^{-1}H_m^{t-[z]_2}, \qquad \left(P^{[2],t}_{n+1}(z)\right)^\top = z^{-n-1}\prod_{m=0}^{\overset{\frown}{n}} (H_m^t)^{-1}H_m^{t+[z]_2}, \quad |z| > r_y.$$

□

Remark 41. *In the scalar case,* $p = 1$, *recalling that* $H_n^t = \dfrac{\tau_n(t)}{\tau_{n-1}(t)}$, *we have the following standard Sato formulas,*

$$P^{[1],t}_n(z) = z^{-n}\frac{\tau_n(t-[z]_1)}{\tau_n(t)}, \qquad C^{[2],t}_n(z) = z^{n-1}\frac{\tau_n(t+[z]_1)}{\tau_{n-1}(t)}, \qquad |z| > r_x$$
$$C^{[1],t}_n(z) = z^{n+1}\frac{\tau_n(t-[z]_2)}{\tau_{n-1}(t)}, \qquad P^{[2],t}_n(z) = z^{-n}\frac{\tau_n(t+[z]_2)}{\tau_n(t)}, \qquad |z| > r_y.$$

5.6. **Bilinear identity and Geronimus–Uvarov and Uvarov transformations.** Bilinear identities [35, 36, 37, 95] are normally formulated for τ-functions, but can be also written down for Baker functions [124, 122, 123]. They are useful when deriving the Hirota bilinear equations as well as a number of Fay identities. We have lengthy discussed about Geronimus–Uvarov transformations, and a question naturally arises. Does it hold a bilinear identity for the Baker functions in where Geronimus–Uvarov transformations plays a role? and further: Do we have a similar bilinear identity for the biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its second kind functions? and for the τ-matrices? The answer to these questions follows.

Theorem 12 (Geronimus–Uvarov bilinear identities)**.** *Let us consider two matrix polynomials $W_C(x)$ and $W_G(x)$, with $W_C(x)$ monic, and the corresponding Gerominus–Uvarov transformation as given in Definition 38. Then, for $r_1 > r_x$ and $r_2 > r_y$, the following bilinear identities holds*

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1} \hat{\Psi}_{1,k}(t',z) W_C(z) \big(\Psi^*_{1,l}(t,z)\big)^\top \,\mathrm{d}z = \oint_{|z|=r_2} \hat{\Psi}_{2,k}(t',z) W_G(z) \big(\Psi^*_{2,l}(t,z)\big)^\top \,\mathrm{d}z, \tag{120}$$

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1} e^{t_1'(z)-t_1(z)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_C(z) \big(C^{[2],t}_l(z)\big)^\top \,\mathrm{d}z = \oint_{|z|=r_2} \hat{C}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_G(z) \big(P^{[2],t}_l(z)\big)^\top e^{t_2'(z)-t_2(z)} \,\mathrm{d}z, \tag{121}$$

and in terms of the matrix functions $\tau^{(1)}(t,s)$ and $\tau^{(2)}(t,s)$ introduced in Definition 55

$$\Big(\oint_{|z|=r_1} e^{t_1'(z)-t_1(z)}\, z^{l-k-1} \hat{\tau}^{(1)}_{k-1}(t'-[z]_1,t') W_C(z) \big(\tau^{(1)}_l(t,t+[z]_1)\big)^{-1} \,\mathrm{d}z\Big) H^t_l$$
$$= \hat{H}^{t'}_n \Big(\oint_{|z|=r_2} z^{k-l+1} \hat{\tau}^{(2)}_k(t',t'-[z]_2) W_G(z) \big(\tau^{(2)}_{l-1}(t+[z]_2,t)\big)^{-1} e^{t_2'(z)-t_2(z)} \,\mathrm{d}z\Big). \tag{122}$$

Proof. Let us first prove (120). If in Proposition 43 we put

$$P(x) = e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x), \qquad\qquad Q(y) = e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y),$$

we find

$$\Big\langle e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x) W_C(x), e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \Big\rangle_u = \Big\langle e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x), e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \big(W_G(y)\big)^\top \Big\rangle_{\hat{u}}. \tag{123}$$

Now, given the entire character in the complex plane of all the functions involved, the Cauchy formula allows us to write

$$e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x) W_C(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=r_1} \frac{e^{t_1'(z)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_C(z)}{z-x} \,\mathrm{d}z,$$
$$e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \big(W_G(y)\big)^\top = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=r_2} \frac{e^{-t_2(z)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(z) \big(W_G(z)\big)^\top}{z-y} \,\mathrm{d}z,$$

for $|x| < r_1$ and $|y| < r_2$. Thus, in order to apply it to (123) we need $r_1 > r_x$ and $r_2 > r_y$, in this manner the circles contain all the x and y projected supports, respectively. Consequently, we have

$$\Big\langle \oint_{|z|=r_1} \frac{e^{t_1'(z)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_C(z)}{z-x} \,\mathrm{d}z, e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \Big\rangle_u = \Big\langle e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x), \oint_{|z|=r_2} \frac{e^{-t_2(z)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(z) \big(W_G(z)\big)^\top}{z-y} \,\mathrm{d}z \Big\rangle_{\hat{u}},$$

and, recalling that the sesquilinear form is continuous in each of two entries, we get

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1} \Big\langle \frac{e^{t_1'(z)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_C(z)}{z-x} \,\mathrm{d}z, e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \Big\rangle_u = \oint_{|z|=r_2} \Big\langle e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x), \frac{e^{-t_2(z)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(z) \big(W_G(z)\big)^\top}{z-y} \,\mathrm{d}z \Big\rangle_{\hat{u}}.$$

Now, from Definition 12 we deduce

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1} e^{t_1'(z)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(z) W_C(z) \Big\langle \frac{I_p}{z-x}, e^{-t_2(y)}\, P^{[2],t}_l(y) \Big\rangle_u \,\mathrm{d}z$$
$$= \oint_{|z|=r_2} \Big\langle e^{t_1'(x)}\, \hat{P}^{[1],t'}_k(x), \frac{I_p}{z-y} \Big\rangle_{\hat{u}} W_G(z)\, e^{-t_2(z)} \big(P^{[2],t}_l(z)\big)^\top \,\mathrm{d}z,$$

and Proposition 67 implies the result.

We proceed with the proof of (121). In this case, we use the Cauchy formulas

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(x)-\mathrm{t}_1(x)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(x)W_C(x)=\frac{1}{2\pi\,\mathrm{i}}\oint_{|z|=r_1}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(z)-\mathrm{t}_1(z)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)W_C(z)}{z-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,z,$$

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(y)-\mathrm{t}_2(y)}\,\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(y)\big(W_G(y)\big)^{\top}=\frac{1}{2\pi\,\mathrm{i}}\oint_{|z|=r_2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(z)-\mathrm{t}_2(z)}\,\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big(W_G(z)\big)^{\top}}{z-y}\,\mathrm{d}\,z,$$

so that we get

$$\left\langle \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1(x)}\oint_{|z|=r_1}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(z)-\mathrm{t}_1(z)}\,\frac{\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)W_C(z)}{z-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,z,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{t}_2(y)}\,\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(y)\right\rangle_u$$
$$=\left\langle \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(x)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(x),\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{t}_2'(y)}\oint_{|z|=r_2}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(z)-\mathrm{t}_2(z)}\,\frac{\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big(W_G(z)\big)^{\top}}{z-y}\,\mathrm{d}\,z\right\rangle_{\hat{u}}.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(z)-\mathrm{t}_1(z)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)W_C(z)\left\langle\frac{\mathrm{I}_p\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1(x)}}{z-x},\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{t}_2(y)}\,\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(y)\right\rangle_u\mathrm{d}\,z$$
$$=\oint_{|z|=r_2}\left\langle\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(x)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(x),\frac{\mathrm{I}_p\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{t}_2'(y)}}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}}W_G(z)\big(\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big)^{\top}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(z)-\mathrm{t}_2(z)}\,\mathrm{d}\,z,$$

which can be simplified to

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(z)-\mathrm{t}_1(z)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)W_C(z)\left\langle\frac{\mathrm{I}_p}{z-x},\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(y)\right\rangle_{u^{\mathrm{t}}}\mathrm{d}\,z$$
$$=\oint_{|z|=r_2}\left\langle\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(x),\frac{\mathrm{I}_p}{z-y}\right\rangle_{\hat{u}^{\mathrm{t}'}}W_G(z)\big(\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big)^{\top}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(z)-\mathrm{t}_2(z)}\,\mathrm{d}\,z.$$

Now, Proposition 28 gives the result. Finally, the τ-version (122) follows from Definition 55 and (121). □

A similar technique leads to a corresponding result when we replace Geronimus–Uvarov by Uvarov transformations. We give no proof and consider only the relation between biorthogonal matrix polynomials and its second kind functions

Proposition 73 (Uvarov bilinear identities)**.** *Let us consider the Uvarov transformation described in* (100)*. Then, the following bilinear identities holds*

$$\oint_{|z|=r_1}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1'(z)-\mathrm{t}_1(z)}\,\hat{\mathrm{P}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)\left(\big(\mathrm{C}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big)^{\top}+\left\langle\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_1(x)}\,\mathrm{I}_p}{z-x},(\beta)_x\right\rangle\left(\mathcal{J}_{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{t}_2}\,\mathrm{P}_2^{[2],\mathrm{t}}}\right)^{\top}\right)\mathrm{d}\,z$$
$$=\oint_{|z|=r_2}\hat{\mathrm{C}}_k^{[1],\mathrm{t}'}(z)\big(\mathrm{P}_l^{[2],\mathrm{t}}(z)\big)^{\top}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}_2'(z)-\mathrm{t}_2(z)}\,\mathrm{d}\,z,$$

for $r_1>r_x$ *and* $r_2>r_y$.

*

Appendix A. Table with transformations: chart of results

Geronimus transformations	
$\check{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y}(W(y))^{-1} + \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{s_a} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_j^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a) l_j^{(a)}(y)$	Theorem 2 (spectral) & Theorem 4 (nonspectral)
Unimodular Christoffel transformations	
$\check{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y} W(y)$ with $\det(W(x)) = \text{constant}$	§2.7.1
Geronimus–Uvarov transformations	
$\hat{u}_{x,y} = W_C(x) u_{x,y}(W_G(y))^{-1} + \sum_{a=1}^{q_G} \sum_{j=1}^{s_{G,a}} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa_{G,j}^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} W_C(x) \left(\xi_{j,m}^{[a]}\right)_x \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a) l_{G,j}^{(a)}(y)$	Theorem 6 (spectral) & Theorem 8 (mixed)
Christoffel transformations with singular leading coefficient and Hankel orthogonality	
$\hat{u}_{x,x} = u_{x,x} W(x)$ with $\det A_N = 0$	§3.6.1
Christoffel and Geronimus symmetric transformations with nonsingular leading coefficient and Hankel orthogonality	
$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W(x) u_{x,x} (W(x))^{\top}$ with $\det A_N \neq 0$ $\hat{u}_{x,x} = (W(x))^{-1} u_{x,x} (W(x))^{-\top}$ with $\det A_N \neq 0$	§3.6.2
Christoffel and Geronimus nonsymmetric transformations with nonsingular leading coefficient and Hankel orthogonality	
$\hat{u}_{x,x} = W(x) u_{x,x} (V(x))^{\top}$ with $\det A_N(W) \neq 0$ $\hat{u}_{x,x} = (W(x))^{-1} u_{x,x} (V(x))^{-\top}$ with $\det A_N(W) \neq 0$	§3.6.3
Uvarov transformations	
$\hat{u}_{x,y} = u_{x,y} + \sum_{a=1}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa^{(a)}-1} \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \left(\beta_m^{(a)}\right)_x \otimes \delta^{(m)}(y - x_a)$	Theorem 10

REFERENCES

[1] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Group factorization, moment matrices and Toda lattices*, International Mathematics Research Notices **12** (1997) 556-572.

[2] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Generalized orthogonal polynomials, discrete KP and Riemann–Hilbert problems*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **207** (1999) 589-620.

[3] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Vertex operator solutions to the discrete KP hierarchy*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **203** (1999) 185-210.

[4] M. Adler and P. van Moerbekee, *The spectrum of coupled random matrices*, Annals of Mathematics **149** (1999) 921-976.

[5] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Hermitian, symmetric and symplectic random ensembles: PDEs for the distribution of the spectrum*, Annals of Mathematics **153** (2001) 149-189

[6] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Darboux transforms on band matrices, weights and associated polynomials*, International Mathematics Research Notices **18** (2001) 935-984.

[7] M. Adler, P. van Moerbeke, and P. Vanhaecke, *Moment matrices and multi-component KP, with applications to random matrix theory*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **286** (2009) 1-38.

[8] C. Álvarez-Fernández and M. Mañas, *Orthogonal Laurent Polynomials on the unit circle, extended CMV ordering an 2D Toda type integrable hierarchies*, Advances in Mathematics **240** (2013) 132-193.

[9] C. Álvarez-Fernández, M. Mañas and U. Fidalgo Prieto, *The multicomponent 2D Toda hierarchy: generalized matrix orthogonal polynomials, multiple orthogonal polynomials and Riemann–Hilbert problems*, Inverse Problems **26** (2010) 055009 (15pp).

[10] C. Álvarez-Fernández, U. Fidalgo Prieto, and M. Mañas, *Multiple orthogonal polynomials of mixed type: Gauss-Borel factorization and the multi-component 2D Toda hierarchy* Advances in Mathematics **227** (2011) 1451-1525.

[11] C. Álvarez-Fernández and M. Mañas, *On the Christoffel-Darboux formula for generalized matrix orthogonal polynomials*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **418** (2014) 238-247.

[12] C. Álvarez Fernández, G. Ariznabarreta, J. C. García-Ardila, M. Mañas, and F. Marcellán, *Christoffel transformations for matrix orthogonal polynomials in the real line and the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice hierarchy*, International Mathematics Research Notices, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnw027.

[13] R. Álvarez-Nodarse, A. J. Durán, and A. Martínez de los Ríos, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying second order difference equation*, Journal of Approximation Theory **169** (2013) 40-55.

[14] A. I. Aptekarev and E. M. Nikishin, *The scattering problem for a discrete Sturm-Liouville operator*, Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik **49** (1984) 325-355.

[15] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Matrix orthogonal Laurent polynomials on the unit circle and Toda type integrable systems,* Advances in Mathematics **264** (2014) 396-463.

[16] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Multivariate orthogonal polynomials and integrable systems*, Advances in Mathematics 302 (2016) 628-739.

[17] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Darboux transformations for multivariate orthogonal polynomials,* arXiv:1503.04786.

[18] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Linear spectral transformations for multivariate orthogonal polynomials and multispectral Toda hierarchies*, arXiv:1511.09129.

[19] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Multivariate orthogonal Laurent polynomials and integrable systems,* arXiv:1506.08708.

[20] C. Athorne and A. Fordy, *Integrable equations in (2+1) dimensions associated with symmetric and homogeneous spaces*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **28** (1987) 2018

[21] M. J. Bergvelt and A. P. E. ten Kroode, *Partitions, Vertex Operators Constructions and Multi-Component KP Equations*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **171** (1995) 23-88.

[22] L. V. Bogdanov, *Analytic-Bilinear Approach to Integrable Hierarchies*, Mathematics and its Applications **493**, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.

[23] M. I. Bueno and F. Marcellán, *Darboux transformation and perturbation of linear functionals*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **384** (2004) 215-242.

[24] M. I. Bueno and F. Marcellán, *Polynomial perturbations of bilinear functionals and Hessenberg matrices*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **414** (2006) 64-83.

[25] A. Cachafeiro, F. Marcellán, *Modifications of Toeplitz matrices: jump functions*. Rocky Mountain Journal Mathematics **23** (1993), no. 2, 521–531.

[26] M. J. Cantero, F. Marcellán, L. Moral, and L. Velázquez, *Darboux transformations for CMV matrices*, Advances in Mathematics **298** (2016) 122-206.

[27] M. M. Castro and F. A. Grünbaum, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying first order differential equations: a collection of instructive examples,* Journal of Nonlinear Mathematical Physics **4** (2005) 63-76.

[28] K. Castillo, L. Garza, F. Marcellán, *Linear spectral transformations, Hessenberg matrices, and orthogonal polynomials*, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (Special number) Supplement No. **82** (2010) 3–26.

[29] Y. Chen and J. Griffin, *Krall-type polynomials via the Heine formula*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & General **35** (2002), 637-656.

[30] T. S. Chihara, *An Introduction to Orthogonal Polynomials*. In : *Mathematics and its Applications Series*, Vol. **13**. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London-Paris, 1978.

[31] E. B. Christoffel, *Über die Gaussische Quadratur und eine Verallgemeinerung derselben*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle's journal) **55** (1858) 61-82 (in German).

[32] R. Cooke, *Infinite Matrices and Sequences Spaces*, MacMillan, London, 1950. reprinted in Dover Books on Mathematics, Dover Publications, 2014.
[33] D. Damanik, A. Pushnitski, and B. Simon, *The analytic theory of matrix orthogonal polynomials*, Surveys in Approximation Theory **4** (2008) 1-85.
[34] G. Darboux, *Sur une proposition relative aux équations linéaires*, Comptes Rendus hebdomadaires Academie des Sciences Paris **94** (1882) 1456-1459 (in French).
[35] E. Date, M. Jimbo, M. Kashiwara, and T. Miwa, *Operator approach to the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili equation. Transformation groups for soliton equations. III*, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **50** (1981) 3806-3812.
[36] E. Date, M. Jimbo, M. Kashiwara, and T. Miwa, *Transformation groups for soliton equations. Euclidean Lie algebras and reduction of the KP hierarchy*, Publications of the Research Institute of Mathematical Sciences **18** (1982) 1077-1110.
[37] E. Date, M. Jimbo, M. Kashiwara, and T. Miwa, *Transformation groups for soliton equations* in *Nonlinear Integrable Systems-Classical Theory and Quantum Theory* M. Jimbo and T. Miwa (eds.). World Scientific, Singapore, 1983.
[38] A. M. Delgado, L. Fernández, T. E. Pérez, M. A. Piñar, *Multivariate orthogonal polynomials and modified moment functionals*, arXiv:1601.07194.
[39] A. M. Delgado, L. Fernández, T. E. Pérez, M. A. Piñar, and Y. Xu, *Orthogonal polynomials in several variables for measures with mass points*, Numerical Algorithms **55** (2010) 245–264.
[40] M. Derevyagin and F. Marcellán, *A note on the Geronimus transformation and Sobolev orthogonal polynomials*, Numerical Algorithms **67** (2014) 271-287.
[41] M. Derevyagin, J. C. García-Ardila, and F. Marcellán, *Multiple Geronimus transformations*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **454** (2014) 158-183.
[42] L. A. Dickey, *On τ-Functions of Zakharov—Shabat and other Matrix Hierarchies of Integrable Equations* in *Algebraic Aspects of Integrable Systems*, eds. A. S. Fokas and I. M. Gelfand, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications **26**, 49-74, Birkhäuser, Boston 1997.
[43] J. Dini and P. Maroni, *La multiplication d'une forme linéaire par une fraction rationnelle. Application aux formes de Laguerre-Hahn*, Annales Polonici Mathematici **52** (1990) 175–185 (in French).
[44] A. Doliwa, P. M. Santini, and M. Mañas, *Transformations of Quadrilateral Lattices*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **41** (2000) 944-990.
[45] A. J. Durán, *On orthogonal polynomials with respect to a definite positive matrix of measures*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics **47** (1995) 88-112.
[46] A. J. Durán *Markov's theorem for orthogonal matrix polynomials*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics **48** (1996) 1180-1195.
[47] A. J. Durán, *Matrix inner product having a matrix symmetric second order differential operator*, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics **27** (1997) 585-600.
[48] A. J. Durán and F. A. Grünbaum, *A survey on orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying second order differential equations*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematices **178** (2005) 169-190.
[49] L. P. Eisenhart, *Transformations of Surfaces*, Princeton University Press, London, 1923. Reprinted by Sagwan Press, 2015.
[50] L. D. Faddeev and L.Thakhtajan, *Hamiltonian Methods in the Theory of Solitons*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, 2007, reprinted from the 1987 version.
[51] P. A. Fuhrmann, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials and system theory*, Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico Università e Politecnico di Torino 1987, Special Issue, 68-124.
[52] W. Gautschi, *An algorithmic implementation of the generalized Christoffel theorem* in Numerical Integration, edited by G. Hämmerlin, International Series of Numerical Mathematics, **57**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1982. 89-106.
[53] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal Polynomials Computation and Approximation*, Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004.
[54] I. M. Gel'fand and G. E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions. Volume I: Properties and Operations*, Academic Press, New York, 1964. Reprinted in the AMS Chelsea Publishing, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.
[55] I. M. Gel'fand and G. E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions. Volume II: Spaces of Fundamental Solutions and Generalized Functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1968. Reprinted in the AMS Chelsea Publishing, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.
[56] I. M. Gel'fand, S. Gel'fand, V. S. Retakh, and R. Wilson, *Quasideterminants*, Advances in Mathematics **193** (2005) 56-141.
[57] J. S. Geronimo, *Scattering theory and matrix orthogonal polynomials on the real line*, Circuits Systems Signal Process **1** (1982) 471-495.
[58] J. Geronimus, *On polynomials orthogonal with regard to a given sequence of numbers and a theorem by W. Hahn*, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR **4** (1940) 215–228 (in Russian).
[59] C. R. Gilson, J. J. C. Nimmo, and C. M. Sooman, *Matrix Solutions of a Noncommutative KP Equation and a Noncommutative mKP Equation*, Theoretical and Mathematical Physics **159** (2009) 796–805.
[60] E. Godoy and F. Marcellán, *An analog of the Christoffel formula for polynomial modification of a measure on the unit circle*, Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana A (7) **5** (1991) 1–12.
[61] E. Godoy and F. Marcellán, *Orthogonal polynomials and rational modifications of measures*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics **45** (1993) 930–943.
[62] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, and L. Rodman, *Matrix Polynomials*, Computer Science and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1982.
[63] L. Golinskii , *On the scientific legacy of Ya.L. Geronimus (to the hundredth anniversary)*, in *Self-Similar Systems* (Proceedings of the International Workshop (July 30 - August 7, Dubna, Russia, 1998)), 273-281, Edited by V.B. Priezzhev and V.P. Spiridonov, Publishing Department, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow Region, Dubna.

[64] F. A. Grünbaum, *The Darboux process and a noncommutative bispectral problem: some explorations and challenges*, Geometric Aspects of Analysis and Mechanics Progress in Mathematics **292** (2011), 161-177, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2011.
[65] F. A. Grünbaum and L. Haine, *Bispectral Darboux transformations: an extension of the Krall polynomials*, International Mathematics Research Notices **8** (1997) 359-392.
[66] F. A. Grünbaum, I. Pacharoni, and J. Tirao, *Matrix valued orthogonal polynomials of the Jacobi type*, Indagationes Mathematicae **14** (2003) 353-366.
[67] F. A. Grünbaum, I. Pacharoni, and J. Tirao, *Matrix valued orthogonal polynomials of the Jacobi type: The role of group representation theory*, Annales de l'Institute Fourier **55** (2005) 2051-2068.
[68] F. Guil, M. Mañas, and G. Álvarez-Galindo, *The Hopf-Cole Transformation and the KP Equation*, Physics Letters A **190** (1994) 49-52.
[69] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of Partial Differential Operators I, Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*, second edition, Springer, New York 1990.
[70] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
[71] W. Hahn, *Über die Jacobischen Polynome und zwei verwandte Polynomklassen*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **39** (1935), 634-38 (in German).
[72] M. E. Ismail and R. W. Ruedemann, *The relation between Polynomials Orthogonal on the Unit Circle with Respect Different Weights*, Journal of Approximation Theory **71** (1994) 39-60.
[73] V. G. Kac and J. W. van de Leur, *The* n*-component KP hierarchy and representation theory*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **44** (2003) 3245-3293.
[74] M. G. Krein, *The fundamental propositions of the theory of representations of Hermitian operators with deficiency index* (m, m), Ukrainian Mathematical Journal **1** (1949) 3-66 (in Russian).
[75] A. M. Krall, *Orthogonal polynomials satisfying fourth order differential equations*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A **87** (1980/81) 271–288.
[76] H. L. Krall, *On orthogonal polynomials satisfying a certain fourth order differential equation*, Pennsylvania State College Studies, 1940 (1940) no. 6, 24 pp.
[77] I. M. Krichever, *The periodic non-Abelian Toda chain and its two-dimensional generalization* (Appendix to the paper B A Dubrovin *Theta functions and non-linear equations*, Russian Mathematical Surveys **36** (1981) 11-92.
[78] B. A. Kupershmidt, *KP or mKP. Noncommutative mathematics of Lagrangian, Hamiltonian, and integrable systems*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **78**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
[79] M. Mañas, L. Martínez Alonso, and E. Medina, *Dressing methods for geometric nets: I. Conjugate nets*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & General **33** (2000) 2871-2894.
[80] M. Mañas, L. Martínez Alonso, and E. Medina, *Dressing methods for geometric nets: II. Orthogonal and Egorov nets*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & General **33** (2000) 7181-7206.
[81] M. Mañas, L. Martínez Alonso, and C. Álvarez-Fernández, *The multicomponent 2D Toda hierarchy: discrete flows and string equations*, Inverse Problems **25** (2009) 0650077 (31pp).
[82] M. Mañas and L. Martínez Alonso, *The multicomponent 2D Toda hierarchy: dispersionless limit*, Inverse Problems **25** (2009) 115020 (22pp).
[83] F. Marcellán, P. Maroni, *Sur l'adjonction d'une masse de Dirac à une forme régulière et semi-classique*. Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata **162** (1992) 1–22 (in French).
[84] F. Marcellán and Y. Xu, *On Sobolev orthogonal polynomials*, Expositiones Mathematicae **33** (2015) 308–352.
[85] A. S. Markus *Introduction to the spectral theory of polynomials operator pencil,* Translated from the Russian by H. H. McFaden. Translation edited by Ben Silver. With an appendix by M. V. Keldysh. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **71**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.
[86] P. Maroni, *Sur quelques espaces de distributions qui sont des formes linéaires sur l'espace vectoriel des polynômes*, in Orthogonal polynomials and their applications, vol. 1171 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, eds. C. Brezinski et al, Springer-Verlag, 1985, pp. 184–194 (in French).
[87] P. Maroni, *Le calcul des formes linéaires et les polynômes orthogonaux semiclassiques*, in Orthogonal polynomials and their applications, M. Alfaro et al, ed., vol. 1329 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1988, pp. 279–290 (in French).
[88] P. Maroni, *Sur la suite de polynômes orthogonaux associée à la forme* $u = \delta_c + \lambda(x - c)^{-1}L$, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica **21** (1990) 223-248 (in French).
[89] V. B. Matveev and M. A. Salle, *Differential-difference evolution equations. II: Darboux Transformation for the Toda lattice*, Letters in Mathematical Physics**3** (1979) 425-429.
[90] V. B. Matveev and M. A. Salle, *Darboux Transformations and Solitons*, Springer Series in Nonlinear Dynamics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
[91] A. V. Mikhailov, *The reduction problem and the inverse scattering method*, Physica D **3** (1981) 73-117.
[92] A. F. Nikiforov, S. K. Suslov, and V. B. Uvarov, *Classical Orthogonal Polynomials of a Discrete Variable*, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
[93] L. Miranian, *Matrix valued orthogonal polynomials on the real line: some extensions of the classical theory*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & General **38** (2005), 5731-5749.
[94] L. Miranian, *Matrix valued orthogonal polynomials in the unit circle: some extensions of the classical theory*, Canadian Mathematical Bulletin **52** (2009) 95-104.
[95] T. Miwa, M. Jimbo, and E. Date, *Solitons: differential equations, infinite-dimensional algebras*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **135**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.

[96] Th. F. Moutard, *Sur la construction des équations de la forme* $(1/z)\partial^2 z/\partial x\partial y = \lambda(x,y)$ *qui admettenent une intégrale générale explicite*, Journal de l'École polytechnique **45** (1878) 1-11 (in French).
[97] M. Mulase, *Complete integrability of the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili equation*, Advances in Mathematics **54** (1984) 57-66.
[98] J. J. C. Nimmo and R. Willox, *Darboux Transformations for the Two-Dimensional Toda System*, Proceedings of Royal Society of London Series A **453** (1997) 2497-2525.
[99] P. J. Olver, *On Multivariate Interpolation*, Studies in Applied Mathematics **116** (2006) 201-240.
[100] A. M. Polyakov, *Quantum geometry of bosonic strings*, Physics Letters B **103** (1981) 207-210.
[101] A. M. Polyakov, *Quantum geometry of fermionic strings*, Physics Letters B **103** (1981) 211-213.
[102] L. Rodman, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials,* in Orthogonal Polynomials (Columbus OH 1989), P. Nevai Editor, NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C. Math. Phys. Sci. 294, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1990. 345-362.
[103] C. Rogers and W. K. Schief, *Bäcklund and Darboux Transformations: Geometry and Modern Applications in Soliton Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
[104] L. Rowen, *Ring Theory,* Vol. I, Academic Press, San Diego CA, 1988.
[105] R. W. Ruedemann, *Some results on biorthogonal polynomials*, International Journal of Mathematics & Mathematical Sciences **17** (1994) 625-636.
[106] M. A. Salle, *Darboux transformations for non-Abelian and nonlocal equations of the Toda chain type*, Theoretical and Mathematical Physics **53** (1982) 1092-1099.
[107] M. Sato, *Soliton equations as dynamical systems on infinite dimensional Grassmann manifolds (Random Systems and Dynamical Systems)*, RIMS Kôkyûroku **439**, (1981) 30-46, Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University.
[108] M. Sato and Y. Sato, *Soliton equations as dynamical systems on infinite-dimensional Grassmann manifold*, Nonlinear partial differential equations in applied science (Tokyo, 1982) 259-271, Mathematical Studies **81**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.
[109] C. Schiebold, *Explicit Solution Formulas for the Matrix-KP*, Glasgow Mathematical Journal **51A** (2009) 147–155.
[110] L. Schwartz, *Théorie des noyaux*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Cambridge, MA, 1950), vol. 1 p. 220-230, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1952.
[111] L. Schwartz, *Théorie des distributions*, Hermann, Paris, 1978.
[112] B. Simon, *Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. Part 1. Classical theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, **54**, Part 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
[113] B. Simon, *The Christoffel–Darboux Kernel* in *Perspectives in partial differential Equations, harmonic Analysis and Applications*, D. Mitrea and M. Mitrea (editors), Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **79** (2008) 295-346.
[114] A. Sinap and W. Van Assche, *Polynomial interpolation and Gaussian quadrature for matrix-valued functions,* Linear Algebra and its Applications **207** (1994) 71-114.
[115] A. Sinap and W. Van Assche, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials and applications,* Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress on Computational and Applied Mathematics (Leuven, 1994). Journal of Computational Applied Mathematics **66** (1996) 27-52.
[116] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials.* 4th ed., American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publication Series**23**, American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, (1975).
[117] A.Tacchella, *On rational solutions of multicomponent and matrix KP hierarchies* Journal of Geometry and Physics **61** (2011) 1319–1328.
[118] G. Yoon, *Darboux transforms and orthogonal polynomials*, Bulletin Korean Mathematical Society **39** (2002) 359-376.
[119] H. O. Yakhlef, F. Marcellán, and M. A. Piñar, *Relative Asymptotics for Orthogonal Matrix Polynomials with Convergent Recurrence Coefficients*, Journal of Approximation Theory **111** (2001) 1-30.
[120] H. O. Yakhlef, F. Marcellán, and M. A. Piñar, *Perturbations in the Nevai matrix class of orthogonal matrix polynomials*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **336** (2001) 231-254.
[121] H. O. Yakhlef and F. Marcellán, *Relative Asymptotics for Matrix Orthogonal Polynomials for Uvarov Perturbations: The Degenerate Cases*, Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics (2016) published online.
[122] K. Ueno and K. Takasaki, *Toda lattice hierarchy. I*, Proceedings of the Japan Academy Series A, Mathematical Sciences **59** (1984) 167-170.
[123] K. Ueno and K. Takasaki, *Toda lattice hierarchy. II*, Proceedings of the Japan Academy Series A, Mathematical Sciences **59** (1984) 215-218.
[124] K. Ueno and K. Takasaki, *Toda lattice hierarchy*, in Group Representations and Systems of Differential Equations, Advances Studies in Pure Mathematics **4** (1984) 1-95.
[125] V. B. Uvarov, *Relation between polynomials orthogonal with different weights*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR **126** (1), (1959) 33–36 (in Russian).
[126] V. B. Uvarov, *The connection between systems of polynomials that are orthogonal with respect to different distribution functions,* USSR Computational and Mathematical Physics **9** (1969) 25-36.
[127] N. Wang and M. Wadati, *Noncommutative KP hierarchy and Hirota triple-product relations*, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **73** (2004)1689–1698.
[128] A. Zhedanov, *Rational spectral transformations and orthogonal polynomials*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **85** (1997) 67-86.